

BRILL'S STUDIES IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

General Editor

A.J. VANDERJAGT, University of Groningen

Editorial Board

M. COLISH, Oberlin College

J.I. ISRAEL, University College, London

J.D. NORTH, University of Groningen

H.A. OBERMAN, University of Arizona, Tucson

R.H. POPKIN, Washington University, St. Louis-UCLA

VOLUME 76



WAYWARD MONKS AND THE RELIGIOUS REVOLUTION OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

BY

PHYLLIS G. JESTICE



BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1997

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Jestice, Phyllis G.

Wayward monks and the religious revolution of the eleventh century
/ by Phyllis G. Jestice.

p. cm. — (Brill's studies in intellectual history, ISSN
0920-8607 ; v. 76)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004107223 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Monasticism and religious orders—Europe—History—Middle Ages,
600–1500. 2. Eleventh century. 3. Europe—Church
history—600–1500. I. Title. II. Series.

BX2590.J47 1997

271'.0094'09021—dc21

96-49111

CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Jestice, Phyllis G.:

Wayward monks and the religious revolution of the eleventh
century / by Phyllis G. Jestice. — Leiden ; New York ; Köln :
Brill, 1997

(Brill's studies in intellectual history ; Vol. 76)

ISBN 90-04-10722-3

NE: GT

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 90 04 10722 3

© Copyright 1997 by Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved.

*No part of this publication may be reproduced,
translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form
or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying,
recording or otherwise, without prior written permission
from the publisher.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	vii
List of Abbreviations	ix
Introduction	1
i. The problem: the monk versus the world	1
ii. The state of the question	6
iii. The “monastic crisis”	8
iv. Dissolution versus definition	12
v. The principles of this book	18
Chapter One Tenth-century monks and social expectations	23
i. The tenth-century monastery as public servant	24
ii. Withdrawal from a tainted world	29
iii. Infiltration of the cloister	35
iv. A foretaste of heaven	39
Chapter Two Missionaries and new monastic dreams	44
i. The imperial mission	46
ii. Wenceslas of Bohemia and changing monastic ideals ...	53
iii. The new language of mission	56
iv. The problem of <i>stability</i>	65
v. Monks and Christian responsibility	69
vi. A Romualdian missionary movement	75
Chapter Three Stability and care: the recluses	90
i. The growing popularity of reclusion	93
ii. Separation and liminality	100
iii. The recluse as caregiver	113
iv. The holiness of recluses	122
Chapter Four The godly society: monks and reform in the eleventh century	128
i. From missionary to wandering preacher	129

ii. The monk as spiritual adept	134
iii. Entanglement with ecclesiastical reform	137
iv. The revival of eremitism	141
v. Romuald of Ravenna and the Camaldolesi	151
vi. Monks and <i>caritas</i>	160
Chapter Five The “new monasticism” of Lotharingia in the early eleventh century	170
i. Lotharingian monasticism and the turn to the world ...	173
ii. Hypocrisy and schism	183
iii. Gregory the Great and the active life	190
iv. Invasion of the monastery	195
v. Is monasticism enough?	200
Chapter Six Monks and the Roman reform	210
i. Monks, the reformed papacy, and ecclesiastical reform	212
ii. Peter Damian versus the Tuscan hermit	217
iii. The quandary of ecclesiastical reform	224
iv. The evidence of Vallombrosa	227
v. A community of reformers	233
vi. Servants of the papacy?	245
Chapter Seven Anti-Gregorian propaganda and the monastic crisis.....	248
i. Hirsau as model for world-reforming monasticism	249
ii. The polemic against Hirsau	255
iii. The disavowal of a radical past	262
iv. Hildebrand the false monk	265
v. The case for Gregory	273
vi. The monastic <i>ordo</i> and Christianity	275
Conclusion	278
Select Bibliography	289
Index	307

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Few things in the world can incur as many debts as a first book. How can one even say how such a thing begins? My personal theory is that my fascination with the middle ages began with my mother reading me King Arthur stories when I was too young and impressionable. I'm sorry she did not live to see my work in print.

Certainly this work would not have been possible without much help along the way, both financially and in patience as I gradually learned what I wanted to say and how to say it. Long ago, when something remotely like this book was a dissertation, Stanford University was generous in fellowship support, a fellowship from the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst supported a year of study in Munich where I enjoyed the outstanding resources of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and a Whiting Fellowship in the Humanities gave me time to write my dissertation. As I realized the inadequacies of that work, revision was possible with the help of faculty travel and research grants from the University of California at Davis.

Thank you to the colleagues I've met at conferences around the country for the past six years, who helped me think through ideas, especially to John Van Engen, who helped me probably more than he knows. Also many thanks to those who have given me support when I've really needed it—you know who you are, especially my students who have encouraged and appreciated me. But above all, I want to thank the professors of the University of Puget Sound, where I received my bachelor's degree in 1982. I don't think I could have gotten a better education anywhere in the world. I certainly never expected to find such warm support there and belief in abilities that I barely suspected I had. It was a glorious voyage of exploration and discovery, that taught me (among many other lessons, both academic and other) that academia is my natural home. I will be grateful all my life to Walter and Frank who were so generous with their time, and taught me that learning was not just something to do for the grades. My special thoughts and fondest memories are of Esther

Wagner, who taught me Latin, fussed over me and cared about me, and whom I loved very deeply. It is one of my dearest wishes that I can someday be half as good a teacher to someone as she was to me. It is to her memory that this book is dedicated.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AASS	<i>Acta Sanctorum quotquot urbe coluntur . . . collegit . . . Joannes Bollandus.</i> (3rd ed. Paris, 1863ff.)
ABR	<i>American Benedictine Review</i>
AfKG	<i>Archiv für Kulturgeschichte</i>
AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
CCCM	<i>Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis.</i> (Turnhout, 1971ff.)
CCM	<i>Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum.</i> Edited by K. Hallinger. (Siegburg, 1963ff.)
DA	<i>Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters</i>
FMSI	<i>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</i>
FS	<i>Festschrift</i>
Hj7b	<i>Historisches Jahrbuch</i>
HS	<i>Historische Studien</i>
HZ	<i>Historische Zeitschrift</i>
Jb	<i>Jahrbuch</i>
JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
Mansi	Mansi, Joannes Dominicus, ed. <i>Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio.</i> Padua, 1767. (Reprint ed. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1960.)
MGH	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
Briefe	<i>Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit</i>
Conc.	<i>Concilia</i>
DD	<i>Diplomata</i>
DOI	<i>Ottonis I. diploma</i>
DOI2	<i>Ottonis II. diploma</i>
DHII	<i>Heinrici II. diploma</i>
DKII	<i>Konradi II. diploma</i>
Epist.	<i>Epistolae selectae</i>
LL	<i>Libelli de lite</i>
SS	<i>Scriptores</i> (in folio)
SS rer. Germ. in us. schol. Schriften	<i>Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum</i> <i>Schriften des Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
MIÖG	<i>Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung</i>
MPH	<i>Monumenta Poloniae Historica.</i> Series 2. (Krakow, 1946ff.)
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus.</i> Series Latina. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 221 vols. (Paris, 1841–1904)
RB	Benedictine Rule. <i>RB 1980. The Rule of St. Benedict.</i> Latin and English. Edited by Timothy Fry. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1981.
Rev. bén.	<i>Revue bénédictine</i>
RH	<i>Revue historique</i>
RhVjb	<i>Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter</i>
SC	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i> (Paris, 1941ff.)
Settimana Mendola	Atti della settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola. (Milano, 1959ff.)
Settimana Spoleto	Settimane di studio del centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo (Spoleto, 1954ff.)

SS rer. Hung.	<i>Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum</i> (Budapest, 1937ff.)
<i>StAns</i>	<i>Studia Anselmiana</i>
<i>StGreg</i>	<i>Studi Gregoriani</i>
<i>StMon</i>	<i>Studia Monastica</i>
<i>Stud. u. Mitt. OSB</i>	<i>Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
ZS	Zeitschrift

INTRODUCTION

One of the most puzzling questions of the middle ages is how such an institution as Benedictine monasticism, vowed to benign contempt for the rest of humanity, could eventually have evolved in the high middle ages into care-giving institutions such as the Franciscans and Dominicans. The seeds of that change lie firmly in the late tenth and eleventh centuries with the transformation of the Benedictine ideal, the way of life preferred by the vast majority of monasteries in western Europe.

The argument of this book is that the driving force behind monastic reform was the issue of monks' active involvement in the world. It traces the development of the notion in the tenth and eleventh centuries that a true ascetic is in a position of moral superiority and thus of obligation to the rest of society. Since the holy man knew God's will more clearly than others, it was his duty to spread the word of God to the rest of the world. This is a position that only very gradually emerged in western Europe in the period of this study. To a large extent, this work deals with ideas in the process of formation. The available sources rarely said that monks were superior, much less that that superiority should translate into action in the world. Therefore this is a study of hints and implications that rarely became conscious statements of belief. The following incident provides a particularly clear example of the problem: the role of a monk, his dealings with the world, and the beliefs of the historians and hagiographers who translated his actions into a form acceptable for wider distribution.

i. The problem: the monk versus the world

In the year 972 a monk named Wolfgang left his monastery at Einsiedeln to undertake a mission to the newly opened land of the Magyars.¹ He was neither the first nor the last monastic missionary

¹ Heinrich Fichtenau, "Zu den Urkundenfälschungen Pilgrims von Passau" *Mitteilungen des oberösterreichischen Landesarchivs* 8 (1964): 81-100. Géza became duke of the

to operate on the eastern borders of the German empire, and in fact his mission was of short duration and had little effect.² The memory of this event probably would not have survived at all had Wolfgang not gone on to become an actively reforming bishop of the important diocese of Regensburg. While such a mission was not unique for monks of the tenth century, the eleventh-century sources concerning Wolfgang's venture show a noteworthy defensiveness about Wolfgang suggesting that, by the mid-eleventh century, actions such as his were the subject of debate. In the twelfth century, many monks left an old congregation for a new one, pointing at the decadence and wealth of the old, the simplicity and poverty of the new. But is this what motivated Wolfgang to leave his monastery more than a century earlier?

Three main sources tell us of Wolfgang's missionary journey, besides passing references to it elsewhere. The *Annales Einsidlenses*, composed at the earliest in 1057, the year when it breaks off, tells that in 972 "the monk Wolfgang was sent to the Hungarians and then in the second year was ordained bishop."³ Arnold of St. Emmeram's wrote his more extensive commentary on this journey in 1035 or 1036, based on an earlier account that is no longer extant.⁴ He tells how Wolfgang went to the east to "Noricum" (the old Roman name of the region) "with a humble following" (*cum humili comitatu*). He asked for permission from Bishop Pilgrim of Passau to preach in the Hungarian lands, to which the diocese of Passau had an ancient

Hungarians in c. 970 and began a new open-door policy to the west that made mission in that region possible for the first time.

² Two views have been presented to explain this failure. Georg Schwaiger, "Der heilige Bischof Wolfgang von Regensburg (972–994): Geschichte, Legende und Verehrung," in *Regensburg und Böhmen: FS zur Tausendjahrfeier des Regierungsantrittes Bischof Wolfgangs von Regensburg und der Errichtung des Bistums Prag*, ed. Schwaiger and Josef Staber (Regensburg, 1972), p. 44 blames Wolfgang's unimpressive record on his lack of knowledge of the language and customs of the area. J. Lajos Csóka, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums in Ungarn* (St. Ottilien, 1980), p. 33 argues that Bishop Pilgrim of Passau ordered Wolfgang away from "his" territory.

³ "Wolfgangus monachus ad Ungaros missus est, qui secundo anno Radesponensis episcopus ordinatus est." *Annales Einsidlenses*, MGH SS 3: 143.

⁴ This is based upon a *vita* of Wolfgang, probably written at the end of the tenth century, that is no longer extant. See Georg Schwaiger, "Die Kanonisation Bischof Wolfgangs von Regensburg (1052)," in *Bavaria Christiana*, ed. Wilhelm Gessel and Peter Stockmeier (Munich, 1973), especially p. 225. Arnoldus s. Emmerammi, *Ex libris de s. Emmerammo duo*, MGH SS 4, (introduction): 544. For more on Arnoldus, see Bernhard Bischoff, "Literarisches und künstlerisches Leben in St. Emmeram" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 51 (1933): 110–12.

claim. Pilgrim's response, at least as understood by the writer, is interesting. The bishop of Passau "tested" Wolfgang on his worthiness for the work. In particular, he was concerned, according to Arnold, "that this wanderer he received was not a gyrovague, but stable and connected to a monastery in the true faith." As the matter worked out, Pilgrim praised Wolfgang for his missionary desires, but decided that it would be best for Wolfgang to become bishop of Regensburg.⁵ The account Othloh, monk of St. Emmeram's in Regensburg, gives in his *Vita Wolfkangi*, also based on the non-extant *vita* and written sometime between 1037 and 1052, shows knowledge of Arnold's work, but carries the tale further.⁶ This story bears careful examination. According to Othloh, Wolfgang, while still a monk at Einsiedeln, turned to contemplation:

... considering within himself how he could increase the silver talent that God had given him for the salvation of others. Because of this matter, deserting, with the abbot's permission, the monastery but not monasticism, he went from Germany to Noricum as an exile, always desiring from the depth of his heart to follow the greater charisma of the apostles. Reaching this eastern land with a humble following, he began to preach to those who lived in Pannonia.

He labored to spread the gospel among the pagan Magyars, only to be recalled by Pilgrim of Passau. According to Othloh, Pilgrim had two motives. One was that he did not want to see Wolfgang wasting his time on such a "sterile" work (*in sulcis sterilibus*).⁷ More important, Othloh repeats the idea that Pilgrim wanted to test Wolfgang, to see if it were possible that he could really be a holy man, since he was a monk wandering outside his monastery.⁸

This set of accounts provides a series of explanations and justifica-

⁵ Arnoldus, (II.1-2): 556-57.

⁶ For dating of the work and its strong element of imitation of Christ, either as an actual or a literary influence on Othloh, see Georg Schwaiger, "Der heilige Gotthard, Abt von Niederaltaich und Bischof von Hildesheim," in *Bavaria Sancta*, ed. Georg Schwaiger (Regensburg, 1973), pp. 40-1; Georg Schwaiger, "Die Kanonisation," in Gessel and Stockmeier, eds., pp. 225-26.

⁷ "reputans iugiter secum, qualiter in salutem aliorum sibi concessum duplicaret talentum. Huius rei gratia abbatis sui licentia monasterium, et non monachum deserens, immo secundum apostolum maiora charismata aemulari cupiens, per Alemanniam devenit exul in Noricum. Ad cuius orientalem plagam cum humili comitatu pergens, praedicandi gratia Pannoniae petit confinia." Othloh s. Emmerammi, *Vita s. Wolfkangi episcopi*, MGH SS 4, (13): 530-31.

⁸ Ibid., (14): 531.

tions of Wolfgang's activities remarkably revealing of monastic attitudes toward evangelization. In the different accounts, the reader passes through stages in which the author simply ignored an unpalatable issue to full-scale defense of Wolfgang's work as a missionary. These works reveal a conscious artistry, including manipulation of the historical events, employed to defend Wolfgang and apparently to make the mission more palatable to readers and hearers. The simplest part of the process of making Wolfgang acceptable appears in the *Annales Einsiedlensis*. The annalist says that Wolfgang was "sent" (*missus est*) on his mission, as many monks had been sent by imperial decree throughout the century. There is good evidence, though, that Wolfgang was neither sent nor summoned, as Klose points out.⁹ Otto II issued Wolfgang a privilege letter allowing him, with the permission of his abbot, to go to convert the Hungarians.¹⁰ That was, however, far from "sending," and appears very different from the high-handed policies of Ottonian rulers who attempted to influence eastern ecclesiastical development by taking monks from royal monasteries and moving them to the east as though they were chess pieces. It is clear that other monks were indeed "sent," as we will see in detail in chapter two. Monasteries, acting under orders, not only provided a Benedictine presence, but most of the bishops for these poor and mostly pagan sees were monks. Unlike them, Wolfgang had no real imperial backing. Still, the annalist includes the element of superior authority in his account. Why did he tamper with the historical record? Possibly it was a simple mistake on his part. The annalist seems well informed, however, which suggests against this possibility. Given his obvious intention to depict Wolfgang as a hero, it seems likely that the author purposely altered the account to make Wolfgang appear more praiseworthy. This in turn suggests that the author of the *Annales* would have had difficulty explaining a monk who just got up and went on a mission on his own initiative. Therefore, he tidies up the picture with the image of a proper monk who goes only if sent.

The authorial goals in these accounts become more complicated in Arnold's history. In his account, Bishop Pilgrim charges Wolfgang

⁹ *Annales Einsiedlenses*, p. 143. See the evidence presented by Josef Klose, "St. Wolfgang als Mönch und die Einführung der Gorzer Reform in Bayern," in Schwaiger and Staber, eds., p. 70.

¹⁰ Josef Borovi, "Parallele zwischen der böhmisch-polnischen und der ungarischen Kirchenorganisation," in *Millenium Dioeceseos Pragensis 973-1973*, ed. Franz Zagiba (Vienna, 1974), p. 55. The privilege is dated 14. August 972.

with one of the greatest possible sins of monastic life—with being a “gyrovague.” This is the type of monk most castigated at the beginning of Benedict of Nursia’s Rule for monks, by far the most popular monastic rule in use in western Europe in Wolfgang’s time. Benedict especially objects to their “instability,” their failure to remain in a single community, a recurring theme throughout the Benedictine Rule. As he says, “Fourth and finally, there are the monks called gyrovagues, who spend their entire lives drifting from region to region, staying as guests for three or four days in different monasteries. . . .”¹¹ Why should Arnold raise questions in his readers’ minds, casting doubt upon his own hero’s motives? The only logical explanation is that Wolfgang, or monks more contemporary to Arnold who also engaged in mission or other forms of activity in the world had enemies all too willing to stick the label “gyrovague” on them. It appears that Arnold felt it necessary to arm himself and his hero in advance with an apologia: Wolfgang had acted well and not all monastic wanderers were evil.

It is in Othloh’s *vita*, though, that we find most of the themes that will surface repeatedly in the course of this book. Othloh deals with a series of possible complaints against extramural activities by monks, in this case by Wolfgang, and presents a strong and succinct five-part defense for such behavior. In the process, he not only gives a rationale for Wolfgang’s action but presents as a moral imperative that monks involve themselves in affairs outside of the monastery. First, Wolfgang went through a period of contemplation instead of making a rash decision to leave his house. Second, the subject of this time of reflection was how he could increase the silver talent God had entrusted to him (Mt 25.15–30) (i.e., his fine monastic education and superior nearness to God, attained through years of prayer and solitude) so that it would lead to the salvation of others. It is interesting that he decides to preach in pagan lands, an important issue in a period of German eastward expansion. Third, although he left the monastery, Othloh claims that Wolfgang did not cease to be a monk—he nurtured the seeds of monasticism in his heart. In other words, the monastic life was not contingent on enclosure within the walls of a cloister. Fourth, this life of conversion and care for others is the true apostolic life. This argument is particularly radical: at least from the eighth century on, writers had described the monastic

¹¹ RB 1.10.

life in terms of the apostolic communal life described in the second chapter of Acts. Finally, like the early Irish monks in *peregrinatio*, a state of ascetic homelessness, Wolfgang's decision is an "exile." He is undertaking this mission as an ascetic act and as an act of obedience to God, not as an excuse to be free of the restrictions of monastic enclosure and to wander around Hungary for a while. An unspoken sixth assumption of this brief account, an assumption central to this book, is that the author thought it necessary to provide an apologia for Wolfgang's actions at all. In other words, Othloh's work is part of the dialogue on the proper monastic life in relationship to the world outside of the monastery, a dialogue that in turn played a central role in the definition of Benedictine monasticism and the creation of new monastic congregations in the eleventh century. Indeed, Othloh uses almost every defense that later monks or their hagiographers used to justify themselves to the world.

ii. *The state of the question*

The goal of this book is to present an alternative theory on how and why monastic life diversified in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Within a century, a single-option system of monasticism, taught by the Benedictine Rule and several centuries of custom, fragmented. A large number of new monastic groups were created that were based on the Benedictine Rule but interpreted it in different ways. Other groups wrote their own rules, or turned to a pre-Benedictine tradition. I approach the question of why this happened through the polemics and apologetics of involvement in or flight from the world, as in the preceding discussion of Wolfgang and his chroniclers. This is a largely experimental approach, based upon a fragmentary trail of allusion and innuendo that becomes clear only toward the end of the eleventh century. Most historians who have addressed the issue of the breakup of Benedictine monasticism have approached it from a twelfth-century perspective, focusing especially on data from the monasteries of France. This is certainly a sensible approach given the sources available. There is also historiographical justification for this earlier work, much of great value, since the historical debate began with studies of the polemics between the two predominantly French congregations of Cluny and Cîteaux in the early twelfth century. While acknowledging my debt to the pioneers in this field, I

have attempted to further our understanding of this issue of monastic diversification by shifting my research both geographically and chronologically. I have used what is basically a reversal of my predecessors' research orientation: I approach the question from the perspective of the tenth and eleventh centuries, before official apologetic material appeared to emphasize the "party line" of the various new congregations of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. I have limited the study as much as possible to monasticism within the German Empire (including Imperial Italy), because I believe this region was much more influential in developing monastic theology than was the West Frankish Empire. It has been impossible to avoid occasional reference to Cluny, however, because often Cluniac sources are the only ones in existence that can help us trace what traditional monks were *supposed* to do, and how, according to this tradition, the monks of our study erred.

The focus of my book can be summed up in the example of Wolfgang of Regensburg with which I began. As I understand the history of eleventh-century monasticism, the most driving force behind reform was some monks' longing for activity in the world outside the monastery's confines. This grew into a large enough phenomenon that it left a literary track beginning in c. 1000. Defenses of and polemics against monks taking an active role in society stand out as important features of monastic life in the eleventh century, and action in the world is often the professed reason for the foundation of the "new" congregations, ones that claimed they reacted against a Benedictine past overly restricted by the accretions of centuries.

My thesis is that new congregations did not develop because of a revulsion of feeling against the prosperity of traditional Benedictine houses, nor did new ideas of monastic poverty suddenly appear from nowhere to discredit older, established houses. I argue instead that the propulsion for change rose within the ranks of the black monks (Benedictines, so identified by the color of their habits) themselves, in an effort to stretch the Benedictine Rule to include both a more literal reading of the gospels and greater accommodation to the social realities of the eleventh century. This especially took the form of interest in the reform of Church and world. What began with a few discontented individuals gradually took on large enough proportions that it could not be ignored by either its defenders or detractors, who provide the raw material for my research. The experience of eleventh-century monasticism was indeed one of diversification, but no one

group came out as the losers. A more clearly defined Benedictinism continued to exist as one of a variety of paths to holiness and still had its place in a society that valued the prayers of professional holy men.

iii. *The "monastic crisis"*

Until very recently, it has been standard in historiography to define monastic change in this period as a "crisis of cenobitism" (the communal form of the broader term monasticism). Morin coined the expression in 1928,¹² and the conditions and preconceptions of monastic change propelled by "crisis" have until recently remained substantially unchallenged. These assumptions are that prior to the year 1000 a Benedictine monasticism existed that was fundamentally the same everywhere, although differing especially on some points of daily practice, and belonging to a variety of great congregations and fraternal organizations. During the "crisis" large parts of the religious community ripped themselves away from the parent stem in reaction to problems within the Benedictine order itself. Thousands of men who would normally have become "black monks" instead joined a variety of new religious congregations, either following a reinterpreted Benedictine Rule or adopting new regulations often written for their specific requirements. Historians have characterized most of these new congregations, as they often characterized themselves in twelfth-century literature, by a focus on evangelical poverty and flight from the world. Following this, historians for the last sixty years or more have used the poverty theory to explain the partial dissolution of a decrepit parent stem.

These basic assumptions have led to the characterization of an embattled Benedictine world, fighting and losing the battle against young monasteries that conformed more closely to the Benedictine Rule than did their predecessors. Thus Jean Leclercq could state as axiomatic that the common character of the eremitical congregations from c. 1100 on was a reaction against the wealth of the cloisters and their ongoing efforts to "look for an effective poverty."¹³ Indeed,

¹² D.G. Morin, "Rainaud l'Ermite et Ives de Chartres: Un épisode de la crise du cénobitisme au XI^e-XII^e siècle" *Rev. bén.* 40 (1928): 99-115.

¹³ Jean Leclercq, "La crise du monachisme aux XI^e et XII^e siècles" *Bullettino dell'istituto storico italiano per il medio evo* 70 (1958): 29.

Leclercq defines the whole "crisis of cenobitism" as a crisis of prosperity—people opened their eyes and realized that monks were not living up to their own ideals, which, according to Leclercq's definition of the Benedictine Rule, included a life of simplicity and physical poverty for the monastery as a whole, not just denial of ownership by individual monks.¹⁴ It seems a compelling argument, except that recent scholarship has shown increasingly clearly that communities such as Cîteaux were not as poverty-embracing as some of their modern followers and historians have believed.¹⁵ The whole question of earlier medieval religiosity has also received further study, although much work still needs to be done on the tenth and eleventh centuries. Consensus is growing that ostentatious display of wealth was a sign of special piety, not decadence. Using this theological model, running a monastery on the proceeds of expensive gifts without spoiling the monks in the process is quite possible. Traditional monasteries held firmly to the earlier medieval belief that to honor a saint (or an important person) all should be beautiful. Some more conservative monks even waxed poetic over the holiness of which treasures were only an outward and visible symbol. For example, Othloh of St. Emmeram in the mid 1050's compares the Church to a costly work of silver, gold, and jewels. Preachers are silver; gold stands for those in the monasteries or other places who are tested with different trials against which they struggle all their lives; jewels are the martyrs and confessors of the Church.¹⁶ Very few people in the tenth or eleventh centuries would have argued against such an analysis.

There is indeed some evidence of reaction against the wealth of the great eleventh-century Benedictine houses, but much less than one would expect from such a sweeping generalization as the thesis that new congregations formed in protest against this rich and beautiful approach to religion. This is especially strange since we are best informed about wealthy houses. It is important to recall, here and always, that for every monastery about which we have information in any detail, there were probably at least fifty to a hundred whose

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁵ Especially for the economic situation of early Cîteaux, see the delightfully iconoclastic article by Derek Baker, "Crossroads and Crises in the Religious Life of the Later Eleventh Century," in *The Church in Town and Countryside*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford, 1979), pp. 137–48.

¹⁶ Othloh s. Emmerammi, PL 146: 120, cited by Helga Schauwecker, "Othloh von St. Emmeram. Ein Beitrag zur Bildungs- und Frömmigkeitsgeschichte des 11. Jahrhunderts" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 74 (1963): 152.

records have not survived, and the richest houses had the best means to preserve their records for the world. There are isolated statements against the wealth of the great monasteries. Most criticism, though, comes from the twelfth century, in the form of polemics for the "new monasticism" such as represented by Cîteaux. These focus on the opposition between Cluny and Cîteaux, so in effect the practices and propaganda of two congregations have provided the bulk of the material for those writing about "poverty-consciousness."¹⁷ I do not believe that one can explain eleventh-century phenomena by reference to propaganda of the next generation.

Nevertheless, influenced by the spirit of Bernard of Clairvaux, some of the few earlier statements against monastic wealth appear to have been misinterpreted or taken to mean more than they actually do, and reports of specific cases have become generalizations. For example, the author of the *Vita Theogeri* reported in c. 1092–6 that a "vulgar" layman reproached Abbot Theoger of St. George's in the Black Forest, arguing that monks live by rapine, and that the whole earth and sea would not suffice to satisfy their greed.¹⁸ One can indeed take this as a criticism of excessive monastic prosperity. This case is very surprising when examined more closely, though. The complaint was made to the abbot of a small new monastery that, perhaps not coincidentally, was one of the abbeys in Germany most involved in the Investiture Contest, the struggle for reform of the Church and for sovereignty between the papacy and the German emperor of the late eleventh century. As we will see, the role of monks in that controversy brought out a wealth of criticism against the monks involved, some of it patently inaccurate. Similarly other statements used as evidence of a reaction against wealth can easily bear another interpretation, very often one that fits my thesis that monks desired activity in the world much better than the definitions currently employed, as I hope to demonstrate.

Morghen has argued that a return to the primitive Church char-

¹⁷ Bernard of Clairvaux' *Apologia* is the best-known of these works. Conrad Rudolph has provided both a new translation of the *Apologia* and has argued, I believe successfully, that this work was a reaction to a special situation, and did not provoke ongoing animosity. See Rudolph, *The "Things of Greater Importance": Bernard of Clairvaux' Apologia and the Medieval Attitude Toward Art* (Philadelphia, 1990), passim. However, the world of Bernard and Peter the Venerable had changed a great deal from that of the tenth and eleventh centuries. I wish to fill in the blanks in the history of how this polemic began, rather than discuss the twelfth-century polemic in detail.

¹⁸ *Vita Theogeri abbatis s. Georgii et episcopi Mettensis*, MGH SS 12, (16): 455.

acterizes the entire religious revolution of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹⁹ This assertion can be supported in a wide variety of ways, ranging from the use of the term in literature to the reforming popes' custom of adopting the names of their pre-Constantinian forebears. What the writers on the so-called monastic crisis have forgotten is that, in the case of monasticism, the term "primitive Church" can signify much more than withdrawal from the world and commitment to poverty. While withdrawal and poverty were very important to the early Fathers of the Egyptian desert, the tales monks read in our period just as often told of intervention to help in the cares of the world. Some early hermits were very active in social and religious concerns, sharing their superior religious insight with those more needy. In this context, it is very useful to note that in the monk-canon controversy of the twelfth century the prototypical hermit Antony of the Desert was used by both sides in the argument, both for and against activity in the world by religious professionals.²⁰ Similarly, any view of the primitive Church must take into account attempts to apply the precepts of the Bible to daily life. The communal life of Acts 2 is *not* all that was imitable in the lives of the apostles. The gospels are full of activity, by both Jesus and his apostles. Jesus ordered his apostles to go out and preach in poverty (Mark 6.8–9), but he also ordered his hearers, or at least the apostles (the applicability of such commands was debated frequently throughout the middle ages), in several places to "love your neighbor as yourself" (Mt 5.43; 9.19; 22.39; Mk 12.31; Lk 10.27), and bade the apostles: "Go therefore and teach all nations . . ." (Mt 28.29). How was a monk, vowed to stability, to understand the meaning of "go and convert"? Did such a statement even apply to him, or was it addressed specifically to the apostles? These are some of the debates, some with roots in the ninth century, that created the notion of a "primitive Church."

Meanwhile, Van Engen has demonstrated conclusively that "neither the word nor the concept of 'crisis' appears as such in any contemporary source." He further demonstrates that attacks on Benedictines were not as numerous as modern historiography would suggest, and points out that it is too common to see monastic history as a series

¹⁹ Raffaello Morghen, *Gregorio VII. e la riforma della Chiesa nel secolo XI* (revised ed. Palermo, 1974), p. 21.

²⁰ Jean Leclercq, "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médiévale," in Basilius Steidle, ed., *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356–1956*, *StAns* 38 (Rome, 1956): 237–41.

of progressive reactions against decadence, of new monasteries valiantly reacting against the religious decline of the smug older régime.²¹ Van Engen also points out that the black monks were never so prosperous as in the first half of the twelfth century, suffering no decline in numbers or benefactions.²²

iv. *Dissolution versus definition*

If Van Engen, in his highly persuasive article, correctly argues that there was no great revulsion of feeling against Benedictines, this destruction of the "crisis" theory leaves a large gap in the monastic, and therefore religious, history of the eleventh century, arguably the greatest turning point in the history of Christianity. This is a time in which monks, would-be holy people, people reacting against monks, etc. certainly played a major role. If no monastic crisis occurred, why did Benedictine monasticism go through an extended and frequently painful process of change and acrimonious debate? Not only did shoots break off from the parent stem, but the black monks themselves had to define their life and goals in the face of criticism from members of new congregations or political opponents. In part of his article, Van Engen points out almost in passing that a viewpoint that one could call a typical "Benedictine mentality" only took shape gradually in the period 850–1050, and that it was rarely given full exposition until after 1125, when Benedictines were forced to define themselves in self-defense against new congregations and the canons regular.²³ In this book, I hope to move that time frame back, to depict a growing concern about the components of the proper religious life that reached at least a temporary settlement among the mother stock of black monks by the pontificate of Urban II (1088–1099).

Founders with visions of reclusion or service to the world or some balance between the two called the new congregations into being. It must be said here at the beginning of the book that one result of the formal dissolution of at least surface monastic unity is that it rein-

²¹ John Van Engen, "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150" *Speculum* 61/2 (1986): 272–74. Van Engen provides a fascinating history of the concept of "monastic crisis" that would be redundant to repeat here.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 276–78.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 285.

forced traditional black monks in their position of mild contact with the world, a fairly easy approach to asceticism, and a conviction that the frequent interaction of regular monks with the laity would lead to a devaluation of their prayer service to the world. This is not a book about decline and renewal, but rather a search to understand the issues that concerned monks in the eleventh century. Why, if traditional arguments of decadence do not fit with the earlier evidence (pre-twelfth-century), would any monks have left the relative mildness and security of the traditional cloister, or have chosen other, new religious options from the beginning of their spiritual journey in this period of transition? An enormous range of religious life opened up for the would-be holy man,²⁴ from the nearly complete solitude of the Carthusians to the activity of wandering preachers in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, such as Bernard of Tiron. The latter was once heckled, while preaching at Coutances, with the question of what a monk, one dead to the world, was doing preaching to the living. The hagiographer clearly placed the questioner in what would have been a familiar role as defender of commonly accepted Benedictine values. Bernard's answer is interesting. Rather than looking to the Benedictine Rule for justification, he said he preferred to follow the example of Paul, who said: "be my follower, as I am Christ's" (1 Cor 11.1). Indeed, he argued that he was better as a preacher than the average member of the secular clergy, because he could preach publicly and yet remain a godly man, i.e., an ascetic.²⁵

Certainly this is not a picture of a new turn from the world after the Gregorian reform movement had failed to overcome the secular sphere, as Cantor has posited. He argues that the new congregations sought a new equilibrium—seeking their own salvation entirely apart from the world and leaving secular matters to laymen.²⁶ Such a view

²⁴ This is a book about male monks, making decisions about matters such as preaching and administration of the sacraments that were not open to nuns, and therefore women religious would be unlikely to appear in the literature even if more information on nunneries in the eleventh century were extant. So I have naturally used the masculine forms of words, except when there is clear evidence that a woman is involved.

²⁵ For the story of Bernard's preaching see the *Vita b. Bernardi Tironiensis*, by Gaufridus Grossus in PL 172, (VI.54): 1399, referring to 1 Cor 11.1. See Johannes von Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs* (Leipzig, 1903, 1906) 2: 53–54; Gérard Meersseman, "Eremitismo e predicazione itinerante dei secoli XI e XII," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente nei secoli XI e XII*, Settimana Mendola 2 (1965), pp. 168–70.

²⁶ Norman F. Cantor, "The Crisis of Western Monasticism, 1050–1130" *AHR* 66 (1960): 66–67.

ignores the overwhelming variety of forms of religious life that emerged in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, many as active as Bernard of Tiron's, and some predating the reform papacy. Cantor's suggestion also implies that monasticism as a whole was caught up in the issues of ecclesiastical reform, an issue I will examine at length. Cantor and other historians have also left out of the equation two of the most important alternatives to Benedictinism: wandering preachers and canons regular.²⁷ Men who chose these religious options diverged most strongly from tradition; one should acknowledge that it was these same men who were most likely to be frustrated by what they may have perceived as the coils of the Benedictine Rule and were seeking new paths to escape to a more active life, sharing their superior religious insight with others. Both these groups have been left out of traditional reckonings, because they do not normally qualify as "monks" under the standard definition. However, as we will see throughout this work, the wandering preacher was by far the greatest precipitator of new monastic forms, while canons regular combined a communal life with ministry to the laity.

My greatest objection to the old scholarship of crisis, corruption, and collapse is that it oversimplifies a central institution in one of the most exciting epochs of European history. It ignores the struggles to break out of what at times appeared as a suffocating tradition. It neglects the fervor of individuals, rather than institutions, that brought about the great religious reforms of the eleventh century. Perhaps most vitally, it fails to credit the very real anguish these "renegades" suffered in leaving the safe nest of tradition for the sake of re-learning old religious goals of evangelization and care for others.²⁸ Some of

²⁷ In the first generations of enthusiasm for canons regular, proprietors of monasteries would often turn them into canonries, much as they would accept a new reform orientation within monasticism. The regular canonical life, after the Aachen Rule for canons fell into disuse in the second half of the eleventh century, was similar in many ways to the monastic life, and many of the polemics between monks and canons in the twelfth century center on the freedom to move from one sort of religious life to another, just as between two monastic congregations. For the similarities and rivalries between monks and canons, see Karl Bosl, *Regularkanoniker (Augustinerchorherren) und Seelsorge in Kirche und Gesellschaft des europäischen 12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1979), passim; to be read with Stefan Weinfurter's review in *AfKG* 62/63 (1980-1): 381-95 and his "Neuere Forschung zu den Regularkanonikern im deutschen Reich des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts" *HZ* 224 (1977): 379-97. See also Giovanni Lunardi, *L'Ideale monastico nelle polemiche del secolo XII sulla vita religiosa* (Noci, 1970), passim.

²⁸ An example of how complex and confusing ascetics could find this new business, especially c. 1050-1100, is the example given by Dereine regarding Odo of

these “wayward” monks, as we will see, suffered vilification or, especially those who remained in the Benedictine fold, the rewriting of their own history to leave their efforts at innovation out of the picture. The story is an exciting one and should at last be pieced together into a coherent picture. It is time to give credit to the spiritual pain of breaking out of the Benedictine cocoon that had swathed religious men and women so effectively since the ninth century that they equated the word of Benedict of Nursia with the word of God.

A work of this sort is a delicate task. My interest is in the eleventh century and its roots in the tenth and ninth centuries, an era I identify, following German historiography for convenience, as the central middle ages. It was a period of dynamic change, as clear and universal definitions broke down, towns grew, the papacy asserted its spiritual authority over all the Christian world—the list could continue for pages. The established congregations of monks and canons regular of the twelfth century had, to a large extent, already defined themselves.

The monk-canon controversies and the debates between various congregations of monks, especially Cluny and Cîteaux, were an argument over whether generally accepted customs were as good as, or better than, those of their opponents. The writers had developed a system of self-understanding within which to argue, and rarely crossed those boundaries. For monks of the tenth and much of the eleventh century, however, there was a single authoritative text to interpret and reinterpret to suit their needs: the Rule of Benedict of Nursia. They had no clear hierarchy through which to understand the relative importance of the Rule to canon law or even to the Hebrew Scriptures or the New Testament. The participants had to lay out the playing field of debate as they tried to define themselves. In this study the issue is the position of monks in relation to contact with the world, including cases in which the participants in the development were not themselves fully aware that their actions were extraordinary. No source exists from the tenth or eleventh century that provides a full apologia or a critique on monks exclusively in regard to their relations with the laity.

Tournai. Odo was a canon regular, then a hermit, then adopted mixed customs in a monastery; all part of a life-long search to find a way to serve God that seemed appropriate to him. Charles Dereine, “Odon de Tournai et la crise du cénobitisme au XI^e siècle” *Revue du moyen âge latin* 4 (1948), especially pp. 138–43.

In the place of such material, it is necessary to comb the extant sources for evidence of a phenomenon that was not fully defined or even understood by its own authors. For this work, I have especially sought statements about monks relative to the laity that appear to stretch the boundaries of the Rule to justify a behavior, as in the case of Wolfgang given above, or from conservatives who attacked monks who tried to play a new role in society. While chroniclers sometimes provide useful information, my most valuable sources have been the *vitae* of saints and the polemical writings of the Investiture Contest. These polemical works, at least half of which were written by monks,²⁹ provide the first full debate over the proper role of a monk in the world. In large part this is because some monks worked actively for the papal party in the propaganda war and especially because the precipitator and energetic leader of the conflict with the emperor, Pope Gregory VII, was himself a monk.³⁰

These polemical treatises are the culmination of a long process of creating a clear definition of monasticism, and of realizing that one can have a holy life even without the Rule and its weight of custom. In them, one can see that two clear pictures of the ideal monk have emerged, one world-repelling, the other acting in the world because of the world's own desperate need. The latter view would not recommend that a monk take lightly upon himself the cares of the world. Nevertheless it expresses an immediacy of need and a conviction that monks, because of their normal state of withdrawal and attendant contemplation, are therefore better able to act within secular society than either the laity or the secular clergy.

Before the polemical treatises of the Investiture Contest, the main sources for a study of changing monastic views toward the world are occasional remarks in *vitae*, the idealized life-stories of saints. *Vitae* are difficult to use as historical sources. They are filled with pietistic and typified views of how a saint ought to, and therefore did, act. Often the hagiographer simply followed the standard form established for monk-saint, or bishop-saint, or martyr-saint, etc. Because of this literary convention saints in hagiography often appear as cardboard figures that remained the same, but could be clad in raiment proper for the literary occasion. *Vitae* also abound with miracles that appear improbable at best to the modern eye. For these reasons historians

²⁹ Van Engen, p. 283.

³⁰ See chapter seven for a full exposition of this subject.

have for the most part dismissed hagiographical sources until quite recently, and *vitae* still must be used with great caution. Yet *vitae* are not all the same, and even the most stereotypical *vita* can provide insight on the author's feelings, perceptions, and values, if not accurate information on the saint at the center of the story. Scenes that the author took for granted as background often give us the most valuable insight into the mores and beliefs of a period. And, in some cases, the author goes out of his way to justify or denigrate a viewpoint, breaking out of the mode of *topos*, which is so strong in this genre as to make digression unlikely without strong reasons. The *vitae* I have investigated show much that was commonplace and therefore reveal a world in enlightening detail. For my purposes, they draw the background scenery but also come closer than any other source to telling what a person (the author) really cared and thought about. For most matters, the standard form will do; when the author breaks out of it, there is cause to believe that this aberration arose from an issue the author cared about personally. Thus, among other issues, *vitae* also show cases of a developing conflict within the ranks of the Benedictines over the issue of care for the world. In an era of scarce sources these attacks and defenses appear in sufficient quantity to show that this was an increasingly important issue, especially in the eleventh century.

Any study that is concerned with the attitudes of monks toward secular society must take into account two issues. The first is that in the tenth century, the starting point for this analysis, several different monastic reforming movements were active. Most of the scholarship of the last century has treated these monastic reforms as a radical break from their Carolingian past. Also, since the publication of Hallinger's *Gorze-Kluny* in 1950,³¹ medieval historians have stressed and overstressed the diversity of these groups. Current historiography (with which I agree) is shifting to a view that monasticism in the tenth century had firm roots in the ninth, when Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane attempted to regulate monastic life throughout the empire. According to this definition, which is gaining support in the field, great houses such as Gorze, Brogne, and Cluny carried out at most a "re-formation" unmarked by significant differences in belief and practice from the Anianian reform of the ninth century. Although

³¹ Kassius Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*, 2 vols., *StAns* 22/3 (Rome, 1950-1951).

many details of practice varied, the houses interested in monastic reform are more remarkable for their similarities than for differences. As a result, it is often possible to speak of a basic "monasticism" that crossed territorial boundaries. This interpretation puts much less emphasis on the theory of a great rivalry between Gorze and Cluny, and acknowledges the rainbow of variants that coexisted within a Benedictine framework.³² This current view goes against the grain for the average reader of monastic history, so the reader must be aware of old biases.

v. The principles of this book

I have undertaken this book with certain general assumptions. The first and most important is that the dominant belief of monks and their public in the tenth and eleventh centuries was that they were a vital link in business dealings with God. Monks played a role as mediators that they could not carry out if they were in frequent contact with the world. Over all monastic diversity lay the assumptions that had found their fullest exposition in the monastic reforming councils of 816 and 817. The Anianian reform went further, though, to put in writing the dominant view of what was meant by monasticism by the early ninth century. Despite the interruptions of barbarian invasion and civil war, the Anianian reforms and especially the view of the world that they expressed lay behind the greatest reform movements of the tenth century, those of the west Frankish Cluny and the east Frankish Gorze. Although monks played many roles in society, the spiritual *raison d'être* of the monastery was to engage in regular liturgical prayer. Most important for this study, monks, to pray well, had to maintain a levitical ritual purity from the pollution of the world that reformers of the tenth century accepted without question.

³² The best work on the use of Anianian material in the tenth century is a collection edited by Raymond Kottje and Helmut Maurer, *Monastische Reformen in 9. und 10. Jahrhundert* (Sigmaringen, 1989). The introduction by Kottje is an excellent summation of scholarship in the field of monastic reform. Also especially useful in this volume is Josef Semmler's article, "Das Erbe der karolingischen Klosterreform im 10. Jahrhundert," pp. 29–78, which makes a convincing argument for continuity from the gradually enforced regulations of the Aachen councils to monasteries in both East and West Francia.

The view that the world is contaminating and that monks could not hope to maintain a wholesome religious life when exposed to its blandishments had a very long life, and indeed elements of it can still be seen today. It was a position particularly strong in the central middle ages, since it reflected the beliefs and actions of a violent, bloody, and often unjust society, in which the average layperson appears to have had few characteristics a monk would have recognized as Christian. Thus, while a monastery as a whole could perform a function in society, individual monks were expected to avoid all risk of infection by careful claustration and the erection of an elaborate rampart of rules for proper conduct when forced into contact with the laity.³³ A monk should of course care for his "neighbor"—this is a dominical precept too clear to be ignored—but this found expression within the walls of the individual monastery or through the medium of prayers for society at large.

A second assumption of this book is that considerable diversity was possible within the model for monasticism developed by Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane. Many behaviors accepted in a given house would have surprised or perhaps even outraged brethren in another region, without their actually being in clear nonconformity with the Benedictine Rule. Pressures placed upon monasteries differed from area to area, especially through such repeated annoyances as war and the intervention of lay rulers. Within the general framework of the world as bad, monks and monastic authors of the tenth century show much variation in what activities could be tolerated or even praised.

This leads to a third assumption, one that may appear obvious but must be stated. Monasticism did not stand still over time. Monks were the most active carriers of the Carolingian renaissance of learning, a process that continued on to ever greater educational advances in the tenth and eleventh centuries.³⁴ Thus cloisters were the most natural place for the discussion of ideas in depth. While it may seem

³³ All of the customaries of the period around the turn of the millennium have similar rules—how monks should not talk to or even see visitors, so contact with this worldly taint was mostly limited to abbot, guestmaster, and cellarer. Most also include prayers for monks leaving on business, and prayers for their return. They are given special, better clothes for travel, and are to keep all monastic offices, including the rule that they should dismount when praying.

³⁴ See Margaret Gibson, "The Continuity of Learning, circa 850–circa 1050" *Viator* 6 (1975): 1–13.

ludicrous to imagine a tenth-century monastery as a “think tank,” it is obvious that the standard of learning in the monastery rose over time, reflecting the gradual transition in society as a whole from the discovery and painful acquisition of old knowledge, to mastery, and on to the freedom of deep familiarity that made it possible to use old ideas in new ways. Monastic reading materials remained fairly consistent over several centuries, as far as we can tell from customaries and surviving library lists. But different generations placed their emphases on different texts, and exegesis continued as always to suit the needs of the society that created it.

The tenth and especially the eleventh century was a period of rapid expansion, both economic and intellectual. We can already see proto-scholastic traces of compartmentalization, putting people in carefully defined boxes, when before a person could play several roles. These new ways of thinking were naturally transmitted to monks as partakers in the learning available to the culture. Thus while a monk like Boniface (d. 755) could be a monk, archbishop, ambassador, and missionary without any ill reflection on his vows, the same could not be said as the term “monk” was defined more clearly over time. Thus Odo of Cluny (d. 944) could intercede with kings, but his second successor Odilo (d. 1049) was criticized as holding court like a king when he traveled outside of the monastery, interfering in secular affairs, and in general not staying in the cloister where he belonged.³⁵

Another basic assumption of this book is that a generally-recognized monastic fragmentation could not take place before the late tenth and eleventh centuries, since before that time there were not enough inter-monastic sources of communication for authors to realize how much diversity existed between religious houses. In the course of the late tenth and eleventh centuries monks became more familiar with the customs and activities of other houses than they had ever been before. Otto I elevated many abbots to the episcopate, many of whom were naturally interested in the monastic communities within their sees. There was more traveling to other monasteries for education, where monks could both observe for themselves and later tell

³⁵ Odilo figures largely in Adalbero of Laon's satirical poem, the *Poème au Roi Robert*. Adalbero produced a not very subtle picture of a busy-bodied, vainglorious, and stupid abbot, who was too pretentious for his own good or that of his monks, who, of course, should be staying in their cloisters. See Adalbéron de Laon, *Poème au Roi Robert*, ed. Claude Carozzi (Paris, 1979), passim. See my forthcoming article on how this poem fits into the historiographical/hagiographical tradition surrounding Odilo of Cluny.

their brethren "how they do it over there." More important was a great sharing of customs among probably thousands of monasteries in the lands that had comprised Charlemagne's empire. Cluny formed itself into a super-abbey, a group of monasteries whose number has been reckoned anywhere from two hundred to two thousand,³⁶ and Cluniac customs were written down and monasteries had to face the inspection of the highly influential abbot of Cluny. Elsewhere, no juridical tie was formed between a parent monastery and the house that it reformed to its own customs. Thus, for example, Gorze remained a single independent monastery, but gave its customs and sometimes its monks to scores of German, Italian, and Slavic houses. It became the norm for monasteries to enter into confraternity with each other, to share prayers for the well-being of other houses and their members, as well as to share information about the monastic life.³⁷ So, in the course of the tenth century, monks became much more aware of what their fellows were doing, even those far away, and could judge other customs and endeavors in relation to their own. It was only when this condition was fulfilled that the process of defining "proper" Benedictinism could begin.

My final assumption is in fact the theoretical foundation for this entire project. It is the belief that if something is important enough to society, someone will eventually write about it. Almost no monks or critics of monks so much as mentioned a goal of apostolic poverty in the tenth and eleventh centuries. But a relative multitude of sources tell of problems related to monks leaving their monasteries and of the reactions that were increasingly expressed and grew to a vituperative debate by c. 1100. In other words, the evidence exists, if I have interpreted it correctly, for the first major rethinking of monastic rules and norms since 816 and 817. The Benedictine Rule, or sometimes its traditional interpretation, was weighed in the balance of monastic hopes and societal expectations, and for many was found wanting. This, as I hope to show, is the underlying causation for what was not a crisis but rather a transformation of professional religious life in the eleventh century.

³⁶ Introduction to Noreen Hunt, ed., *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages* (London, 1971), p. 2.

³⁷ The ground-breaking work of Kassius Hallinger enabled scholars for the first time to see Gorze as a significantly different phenomenon from Cluny. Although his theory of opposition between the two ways of life has largely collapsed, it is to Hallinger and his school that we must look for the most valuable research done in the last forty years on the subject of ties between monasteries.

CHAPTER ONE

TENTH-CENTURY MONKS AND SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS

Monks in the central middle ages, the period from c. 800 to c. 1050, were not primarily holy men. It is more true to say that the monastery was a holy place. Monks were rarely expected to stand out for their personal piety. Instead, what abbots, reformers, and society at large demanded was rather a communal purity, a form that would enable monks to fulfill their primary function in society—offering prayer for the world and its members who were more distanced from God. As we will see in this chapter, very few people questioned that prayer was the more effective, the more monks distanced themselves from the pollution of a world that was fundamentally tainted by original sin. This attitude continued as an assumption behind the monastic theology of the early proponents of the early tenth-century reforming movements. Gorze and Brogne in Lotharingia, as well as Cluny in Burgundy, were, at least in their first generations, motivated by a desire to withdraw as far as possible from worldly contagion.

Everywhere they turned, the reformers of the tenth century were “cleaning up” and refounding monasteries that had suffered damage or had become lax in observance during the disruptions of civil war and Viking raids. When they did so, they turned to beliefs about monasticism that were already well established. Their primary model was the monastic reform led by Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane in 816 and 817.¹ There had been reforms before, but this

¹ By the time of Charlemagne, most monasteries on the continent followed the Benedictine Rule. This was given greater emphasis and much greater precision by the reforming synods of Louis the Pious and his monastic advisor Benedict of Aniane in 816 and 817. These meetings produced a body of canon law that mandated conformity to the Rule with a very strong emphasis on physical separation from the world, as can be seen in the reforming decrees (see CCM, vol. 1). Clearly many provisions of the Aachen legislation were already commonplace to many, if not most, monasteries. For example, the monk who copied the *Statuta Murbacensia*, a form of the 816 regulations, duly includes one reform prohibition, but with the rather puzzled note that “we’ve never done that.” *Statuta Murbacensia* (816), in CCM, vol. 1, (c. 22) p. 447. This legislation provided much of the underpinning of tradition for later interpretation of the Rule. Many articles have emerged from studying the Anianian reform in the past three to four decades, especially in connection with

one was special in leaving a large body of *written* legislation and advice that could develop more or less as times were propitious, and focusing interpretation of the Benedictine Rule on the beliefs about proper monasticism that had been codified in the early ninth century. By the tenth century, that envelope of “clarification” had turned into a hard patina of tradition, often impossible to separate from the Rule itself. The Anianian ideal, that had at most a partial existence in its own time, was a convenient tool for monks and abbots who wanted to do their own reforming in the tenth century. This was a society into which the Anianian tradition fit comfortably. It is hardly surprising that tenth-century monastic reformers, depending on existing written and oral tradition, created in the process of their own reforms a life even more world-rejecting than that proposed by the Anianian reformers.

i. *The tenth-century monastery as public servant*

One way reformers tried to assert their values even in the face of the hospitality and care of others that society had come to expect from monasteries was through their repeated attempts to integrate the abbot into the life of the community. The ninth-century reformers had worked around the issue of the absentee abbot. Such an anomaly became more glaring in the tenth century, perhaps because in the face of this enforced tension between an active life and monastic quiet, monks were becoming more sensitive to the issue. Reformers fought neglectful and irreligious abbots, and above all took a stand against the institution of lay abbacy. The lack of an abbot elected and living in accordance with the Benedictine Rule was potentially the worst disruption of a religious house; certainly not all monasteries could maintain a regular life of prayer in the absence of an authority

the publication of a critical edition of the Anianian regulations in the *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum*. Particularly interesting articles on the subject are Eduard Hlawitschka, “Zur Klosterverlegung und zur Annahme der Benediktsregel in Remiremont” *ZS für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 109 (1961): 249–69; Josef Semmler, “Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahr 816” *ZKG* 74 (1963): 15–82; Semmler, “Zur Überlieferung der monastischen Gesetzgebung Ludwigs des Frommen” *DA* 16 (1960): 309–88; and Philibert Schmitz, “L’influence de saint Benoît d’Aniane dans l’histoire de l’ordre de saint-Benoît,” in *Il monachesimo nell’alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*, Settimana Spoleto 4 (1957): 401–15. The last article gives the best overview of the Anianian reform and its level of success.

figure, while the use of monasteries' economic resources by granting the abbacy to a layman could be very distracting to the monastic life indeed, especially if the lay abbot chose to take up residence with his followers within the monastic enclave.² Hence the abolition of lay abbacy was a central goal of tenth-century reformers. The practice eventually did die out, a clear indication that nobles and rulers with the power to manipulate abbatial appointments accepted the view that monks ought to lead as completely a "regular" life as possible, a view that was understood to mean actual physical separation from the laity. One can also find several statements against pluralism in the extant sources: the abbot should remain in one monastery, not divide his time by administering several. Above all, he should be in a position to be a true father to his monks.³ The abbot should be an example: the first in the community in prayer, fasting, and pious lifestyle.⁴ In other words, there ought no longer be exceptions. The monastery, according to the standards of normal good observance of the tenth century, reformed or not, could not overlap with the world except to the great spiritual detriment of those involved.

The social world of the monastery of course made some contact with secular society necessary. Although this is a study of monastic thought, admittedly one with important social ramifications, one must also take into account the recent and significant insights scholars have gained on the social and political ties of monasteries with the world in the central middle ages.⁵ Indeed, it is the visible pressure put on

² Although reformers themselves saw lay abbots as an unnecessary evil, Franz J. Felten, *Äbte und Laienäbte im Frankenreich* (Stuttgart, 1980), evaluates lay abbacy as a mostly positive institution. He points out that many lay abbots took their positions seriously, and that they could then have been invaluable as advocates for the monastery at court, and could have protected it from neighboring enemies or further exactions.

³ Burchard of Worms opposed the possession of multiple abbacies. Burchard Wormaciensis, *Decretorum libri XX*, PL 140, (VIII.81): 808. It is interesting that on this point Cluny differed from monastic practice within the Empire, as the abbots of Cluny from the beginning held multiple abbacies as a matter of course. German reformers sometimes held several abbacies while engaged in reform, but normally turned over their new possessions to a disciple as soon as reformed practice was firmly established.

⁴ Ratherius Veroniensis, *Praealoquiorum libri VI*, CCCM 46A (1984), (V.32): 167.

⁵ See for example Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1982); Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter. The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049* (Ithaca, 1989); John W. Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in early medieval Germany, c. 936-1075* (Cambridge, 1993); Bernhardt, "Servitium regis and Monastic Property in Early Medieval Germany" *Viator* 18 (1987): 53-88. See their bibliographies for further examples. An especially good study of an

monasteries within the empire to play an active role in the world that makes it possible to see how monks interpreted their traditional place in society. The obligation of monasteries to perform services for the ruler became more rather than less pronounced in the tenth century, despite the activities of many monastic reformers to enforce claustration and the separation of monks from worldly matters. This activity by itself suggests that monastic self-understanding included real physical separation from secular society. These beliefs were gradually molded into a variety of forms during this period, including at times the abandonment of the Benedictine Rule for that of Augustine. While some accepted activity in the world, other houses and individuals resisted it.

The most important catalyst for defining this somewhat unfocused Benedictinism was certainly the increasing authority and centrality of the Ottonian regime, which made increasing demands for educated personnel and for the money and services needed to carry out its policies. Imperial monasteries, eighty-five of them by the end of the tenth century, were used in a variety of ways, and episcopal and noble monasteries played a similar role for their lesser protectors. Rulers often employed monasteries openly as strategic points for the control of areas in the face of both secular lords and overly-ambitious bishops. This is especially evident in Lotharingia, which still had many ties to the West Frankish kingdom, and in the newly conquered eastern territories.⁶ Monasteries had an obligation to provide hospitality to the imperial court in its continual wanderings, a necessary underpinning for a government that could maintain respect for its authority only when the emperor led a peripatetic life, enforcing his orders in person.⁷ Abbots, part of the small educated elite of this society, were

individual house is Eduard Hlawitschka, "Herzog Gisbert von Lothringen und das Kloster Remiremont" *ZS für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 108 (1960): 422–65.

⁶ For Lotharingia, see Heinrich Sproemberg, "Die lothringische Politik Ottos des Großen" *RhVjb* 11 (1941): 17; the eastern situation will be described in detail below. For Otto I's use of imperial monasteries as a counterweight against bishops, see Robert Holtzmann's classic, *Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit (900–1024)* (Munich, 1941 (reprint ed. 1967)), especially p. 183. It should be noted that even the reform of monasteries was politics of the highest order, rather than an effort carried out only from consideration of the well-being of the monks themselves. For nobles it was a means to pacify an area, gaining new friends and influence, and to ally themselves with royal policy. See Hlawitschka, "Herzog Gisbert," pp. 458–62.

⁷ See Hagen Keller, "Grundlagen ottonischer Königsherrschaft," in *Reich und Kirche vor dem Investiturstreit*, ed. Karl Schmid (Sigmaringen, 1985), p. 19, for the importance of hospitality duties of monasteries and ecclesiastical princes.

prominent as advisors to Ottonian rulers.⁸ The imperial monasteries also supplied a large percentage of the fighting force in Ottonian and Salian armies. Thanks to a unique record, we know that in 981 German monasteries sent 410 knights to serve in Otto II's ill-fated expedition to southern Italy, compared to a total of only 508 supplied by all lay vassals combined.⁹ Rulers and other nobles who controlled monasteries did not forget the established role of their houses as prayer institutes for society. Still, even this aspect of monastic life had its political uses. When creating ties of friendship with German magnates, Henry I (d. 936), for example, promised prayers by his monks as bribes.¹⁰

The list of political and social ties that bound monasteries as corporate institutions to various powerful figures, and to social groups such as paupers, could be continued at great length. The last few years have seen much valuable work on the monastery as part of a much greater social web than has traditionally been postulated. This connectedness had an inevitable effect on the members of the monastic community. It is possible to see this in efforts to enforce claustration, and in synodal decrees against unnecessary travel by abbots. The richer the community, thanks to bequests and gifts by secular friends, the greater the burden and distraction of estate administration.

Except in cases of misconduct or an absentee abbot, the monastic round of life in a house of regular observance was constructed so most monks or nuns very rarely had occasion (or permission) to venture beyond the monastic enclave. Officers were appointed to deal with such unpleasantness. Of course the main official who bridged the gap between monastery and world was the abbot. It was hard for monastic authors to depict the holder of an abbacy, sometimes a nobleman who in the large imperial monasteries was often even a royal appointee, as someone who suffered spiritual deterioration for the greater good of the community. Writers from the reform circles got around this problem by insisting that *their* abbots, no matter how important in the affairs of the greater world, really spent all their

⁸ Several abbots were active at the court of Otto I. A convenient example is provided by Kassius Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny, StAns* 22/3 (Rome, 1950-1951), 1: 103.

⁹ Norman F. Cantor, "The Crisis of Western Monasticism, 1050-1130" *AHR* 66 (1960): 49.

¹⁰ Gerd Althoff and Hagen Keller, *Heinrich I. und Otto der Große: Neubeginn und karolingisches Erbe* (Göttingen, 1985), 1: 63.

time longing for the quiet of the cloister, incidentally beginning the process of justification used by the wayward monks who are the subject of this book. Thus monastic authors maintained an untarnished image of their own rulers, while preserving intact the sense of moral peril that the average monastic official faced. Only the manifest need of the Christian community, which in the case of Germany included visits to the imperial court, could justify the time an abbot spent away from his cloister. He should not make excuses to appear in the world. Thus an important abbot like Witigowo of Reichenau (985–997) was praiseworthy to his panegyrist because he avoided travel without good reason. This made it possible to consider him a good monk, despite considerable absenteeism.¹¹ The need for monks to justify the activities of their abbots, who, thanks to the political and economic situation of the age, could not have avoided secular entanglements even had they wanted to, led to interesting reinterpretations of monastic duty.

But most of the demands of the world upon the monastery were just that—demands on the monastery as a whole, not upon the individual monk. If one asks how much effect these exactions and political responsibilities had upon monastic life and especially on monastic ideology, the answer is that in a well-regulated monastery there need not have been any significant effect on the daily life of the community, except on the abbot and the guestmaster. For example, the extant monastic sources give no hint at all that the average monks of the house had any contact with the warriors the monastery provided to the ruler. The abbot was indeed frequently obligated to lead such forces in person on campaigns,¹² but the abbot was in many ways the intermediary between monks and world, and not bound by traditional monastic rules. Many abbots also played an important role as imperial advisors, reflecting their noble birth and separate status. Occasionally a monk was called to imperial service, but except in the case of missionary work such activity was rare. Few monks

¹¹ Purchardus, *Carmen de gestis Witigowonis abbatis*, MGH SS 4, (ll. 170–173): 625.

¹² This practice continued through most of the middle ages. Lampert of Hersfeld gives a particularly poignant example. Henry IV called out all of his princes to join in an expedition against the Saxons in June of 1075. Among them was Abbot Wideradus of Fulda, who was crippled and for two years had been suffering from paralysis. But the king would brook no excuse for non-attendance, so Wideradus had to set out. Not surprisingly, he died within a month. Lampertus Hersfeldensis, *Annales*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol., pp. 215–16.

would have met lay guests in the monastery, so even royal visits, while a severe drain on resources, would not have necessitated any change in the structure of the monastic round after the community had formally received the ruler.

ii. *Withdrawal from a tainted world*

Several historians have turned to charters of monasteries for evidence about their socioeconomic role. This type of evidence focuses quite naturally on contact with the world and the need for wealth to keep a monastery in operation. But such evidence, culled from the charters, has little to do with how monks felt about their role in the world. Any monastery in the middle ages really consisted of two worlds: the life of contemplation and prayer in a cloistered community, and the monastery that was a landholder and had to appoint members to take care of business. The life of the mind and praise of God are what the monks were proud of, and so we hear much more about this side of their activities. There are so many extant treatises and other works about spiritual life compared to other extant written documents that it is hard to believe that the monastic world ever had to deal with problems such as what to do with the sheep manure. This constellation of practical problems formed the second monastery, enmeshed with and partly threatening the spiritual life of the monastery, the practical landholder, that some monks had to regulate. It is interesting that some monasteries did deal with the problem of monk-farmer and monk-landlord; it suggests that monks may have been discontent with the way matters stood. Monks had to cope with their property, and several solutions emerged, such as the Cistercians with their laybrethren, or the common practice in the tenth century of having a layman act as *advocatus*, a lay caretaker who would look out for the monastery's possessions.

The growing popularity of the doctrine of original sin, especially visible in the ninth century, led a large part of the ascetic community to urge ascetics to physical separation rather than mere interiority. Because of the primal Fall, humanity is easily tempted and distracted by things that are good in themselves, but that lead to the neglect of things spiritual. This thought was developed by writers of the Carolingian renaissance, most notably by Hrabanus Maurus (d. 856) in his *de oblatione puerorum* (*On child oblation*). In this treatise he firmly proclaims

his belief that there is no safety outside the beneficent prison of the cloister, "nor can there be security sleeping with a serpent close by."¹³ The worst temptation for these new dwellers in Eden was that of their unredeemed fellow humans, who still wallowed in the slough of original sin and appeared to enjoy themselves altogether too much in the process. Physical withdrawal from such temptation was the only way to ensure safety.

In the central middle ages, religious people clearly thought in very concrete, physical terms about their spiritual lives. As understood throughout the middle ages, original sin was transmitted by the act of sexual intercourse. Besides that, though, all the senses were ready to play traitor. Contact with those whom monastic vows had not cleansed was actually polluting, as if conveying a disease to the unfortunate who made the contact.

What we can gain from extant literary endeavors is a strong statement that monks should maintain physical separation from the world and laypeople in general. Monastic customaries reinforced this view, trying to make every necessary point of contact into a religious symbol. For a cloistered religious to lay any claim to holiness of life, it was necessary for him or her to pay at least lip service to the belief that all contact with the world is demeaning and polluting. It is not surprising that quiet withdrawal was advocated for nuns, as in a list of the virtues of a tenth-century abbess of Northusen that prominently included the fact that "she rarely went out of the monastery."¹⁴ After all, sexual purity formed a large part of the ideal of holiness, and the vast majority of medieval writers assumed that women were less able to keep themselves undefiled, either from moral weakness or because of relative physical weakness, than were men. However, the same values, with a similar degree of emphasis, were professed for monks as for nuns. Thus a chronicler praised the monk Ratpertus of St. Gall (d. c. 910) for leaving the cloister so infrequently that he wore out only one pair of shoes a year.¹⁵ Similarly, the monks of Alanesberg are singled out for praise because they lived "unknown to the world" (*saeculo incogniti*).¹⁶ This example is particularly interest-

¹³ "Nulla securitas est serpente vicino dormire." Hrabanus Maurus, *Liber de oblatione puerorum*, PL 107: 440.

¹⁴ "monasterium raro egredi." *Vita Matildis reginae antiquior*, MGH SS 10, (15): 581.

¹⁵ *Casus s. Galli*, MGH SS 2, (3): 95.

¹⁶ DOI #199, [a. 959], p. 279.

ing because the diploma of Otto I from 959 in which it appears concerns the transfer of the entire monastery to a new site more suitable for comfortable communal life, since Alanesberg was "very incommodious" (*valde incommodum*). There is no hint of reproach at the move, nor at the fact that these monks who, as the document states explicitly, have given up the world, are considering their personal comfort in this relocation. Far from criticizing, the king gave them two additional land grants in the same document. It seems clear that "the world" the monks ought to avoid in this case is not equivalent to basic creature comforts. Nor does it appear to mean that the monks had moved to an isolated area where no laymen were likely to have any contact with the house. Instead, the author of the diploma appears to suggest that the individual monks in the community are physically separated from regular physical contact with the laity. In all probability that is the meaning of the writer's statement that the monks have given up the world and follow the precepts of the Benedictine Rule: "under the yoke of God, these men have chosen to fight in their militia unknown to the world."¹⁷ This was by no means a contradiction in the spirit of the time.

For most of the tenth century the demands German rulers placed upon abbots and their monasteries were usually for personnel, goods, and prayers. This combination led to a reemphasis of the traditional interpretation of Benedictine life as one of physical separation from the pollution of secular society. Thus, for example, the strongest statements in favor of withdrawal from the world come from monks raised to a position of authority. To draw on a Burgundian example, Odo of Cluny, a noted wanderer from his monastery for the cause of monastic reform, pointedly told his monastic readers that it was bad for them to speak too much, to laugh, or to "walk around much"; all such activities, he warned, can lead far too easily to sin.¹⁸ Even more pointedly, Rather of Verona warns monks: "... beware public assemblies, flee secular companions," adding that it is the sheep who leaves the fold that exposes itself to wolf-bite.¹⁹ Part of his pessimism is probably a matter of timing. After a short tenure as bishop of Verona, he was deposed and imprisoned from 936 to 939. He must

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Odo Cluniacensis, *Collationes*, PL 133, (II.19): 565, based on Is 3.16-17.

¹⁹ "conuentus publicos caueto, contubernia secularium fugito. . ." Ratherius Veroniensis, *Praeloquium*, (V.30): 166.

have had plenty of time to think about the issue. Rather himself had led a hopelessly irregular life, leaving his monastery from pride (as he says at many points in the *Praeloquia*), trying to curry favor at the imperial court to get a bishopric along with other crimes and misjudgments of which he repents at great length in his *Praeloquia*.²⁰ Rather's pessimism about the larger world that he inhabited for so short a time as bishop reflects a basic feeling that the reader finds in most old-style monastic writings of the tenth and eleventh centuries—the sense that there is no security in the world. The person outside of the cloister must always be on guard against danger, especially possible sin. For security, one must wait until he or she has arrived at the final port (death).²¹

While monks could not themselves affect the role of their abbots in the world, monks could and did turn to the effort of explaining and justifying their brethren whose daily work as officials forced them into worldly concerns. The monks who had charge of provisioning the monastery and tending to its outside land holdings and other interests led a curiously double life, if one is to believe the sources. To start, no good monk should bring the cares of his office home to the monastic family. Officers were to be chosen not so much for their skill in administration, rarely mentioned by our authors, but for their lack of vulnerability to worldliness. Thus the author of the tenth-century customary of Fleury gives careful advice on the selection of the provost, who had charge of outside matters necessary to the monastery. Such an officer should be a mature brother. The author especially stresses that the provost should be well-endowed with *gravitas*, a proper air of seriousness, “lest there be a suspicion that anything worldly might be permitted to sneak in [to the monastery] through him.”²²

²⁰ Hans M. Klinkenberg, “Versuche und Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie bei Rather von Verona” *AfKG* 38 (1956): 265–314 provides an excellent analysis of the *Praeloquia*. For Rather's personal statement on his failures as a monk, see *Excerptum ex Dialogo Confessionali*, PL 136: 391–444.

²¹ Ilarino da Milano, “La spiritualità dei laici nei ‘Praeloquia’ di Raterio di Verona,” in *Raterio da Verona*, Convegni del centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 10 (Todi, 1973), p. 61.

²² “ne suspicio aliqua seculi subintrare per illum fas sit.” *Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores*, ed. Anselmus Davril and Linus Donnat, CCM 7,3, (6): 13. This work, a report on the customs of Fleury in the time of Abbo (998–1004), is a particularly valuable source of information both for the customs of Fleury itself and for what German monks considered suitable for import to their own houses. Thierry of Fleury (or of Amorbach) composed this work, probably addressed to Bernward of Hildesheim,

Above all, hagiographers required their heroes, if they were so unfortunate as to be elected to a monastic office, at least to hate their work. Under normal circumstances, to hold such an office as that of cellarer was incompatible with true holiness of life, for men as much as for women. The only possible reason for accepting the job was that of acting in obedience to a superior authority. In a rare case for which we have edifying information from a nunnery instead of a monastery, we can speculate that nuns were dealing with some issues similar to those of monks. Gerhardus in his *vita* of Bishop Ulrich of Augsburg (written not long after the bishop's death in 973) mentioned a very pious nun who refused to become cellaress, even when the bishop ordered her to do so. Here, the lesson the hagiographer wished to teach was one of obedience. Gerhardus stresses the nun's piety, to make it plain to his readers that what the bishop was asking her to do is naturally and spiritually repugnant—the cellarer is in charge of provisioning the monastery, and has to deal almost daily with secular laborers and suppliers. In this case, the nun was stricken with paralysis as punishment for her disobedience and healed only when she had repented and accepted the office.²³ The connection of piety with a refusal to take on such a potentially compromising and even dirtying job is not at all surprising, though. By the monastic standards of the day, the best monks and nuns would be the most likely to want to avoid such an office, on the simple ground that it would be at best distracting and at worst a moral peril.

The *vita* of the reforming leader John of Gorze (d. 975), written by his friend John of St. Arnulf's in Metz, sheds clear light on what the first generation of Gorzians considered the proper way to hold a practical position such as that of cellarer. John of Gorze was one of the original re-founders of Gorze as a reformed community in 933, and for a time served as cellarer of the community before he became abbot. The *vita* breaks off abruptly before John's abbatial election; one can only imagine how the hagiographer would have described the necessary duties of the father of an active reforming community. However, his treatment of John as cellarer can give some hints. John of St. Arnulf's elaborated on his hero's stint as cellarer at great length, apparently to justify his assertion of John's holiness in light of the

in c. 1015, perhaps to help in the founding of the monastery of St. Michael's in that city. See the analysis of the text by Davril and Donnat, pp. 333–36.

²³ Gerhardus, *Vita sancti Oudalrici episcopi*, MGH SS 4, (19): 406–7.

apparently contradictory fact that he had held this office. The hagiographer paints a very strange picture of the cellarer's office. It is recounted in John's favor that he went out only very rarely to supervise the possessions of the monastery. If necessity forced him to remain outside of the monastery rather than return to Gorze for his meals, the saintly future abbot was careful to eat and drink by monastic measure.²⁴ Despite this, the hagiographer tells that John, when forced to "go outside [the monastery]" would show a cheerful face to those he met. The author is careful to explain, though, that "when afterwards he [John of Gorze] conversed with any spiritual men, he groaned with sorrow that such secular conversations could never interest him for even a short time, but rather that through them he would lose something from his own accustomed way of life, and besides that that he should expend more than he ought of the goods belonging to the brethren." The author of the account concludes that it is simply best to remain in the monastery.²⁵

One should not take this account of John of Gorze as representative of daily life in a tenth-century monastery, even in one that was part of the Gorzian reforming circle. Even John of St. Arnulf's clearly treats his hero as unusual: he is a virtuoso in holiness. Certainly cartularies from the tenth century make it plain that monastic officeholders included some hardheaded businessmen, and a monastery could hardly have survived with as little care for its properties as is shown in John's *vita*. But this *vita* can be taken as representative of the virtues the early leaders of the Gorzian reform wished to inculcate, and of how they themselves wanted to appear to a larger audience. It presents us with a carefully drawn view of monastic idealism in tenth-century Lotharingia. This is a world that accepted the necessity of dealing with considerable landed wealth and royal patronage. Accounts like this worked with that reality, but added a detailed over-layering of traditional Benedictine interpretation. Under such terms, John's appointment as cellarer, undertaken in obedience to his abbot and out of a desire to serve the community, becomes a testing ground for his virtue. It is a dangerous test; the world is full

²⁴ Iohannes abbas s. Arnulfi, *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis*, MGH SS 4, (85): 361.

²⁵ "Sed dum postmodum spiritualibus quibusque colloqueretur, dolendo ingemibat, se numquam ita secularium conversationi vel ad breve posse interesse, quin aliquid de consueto sibi modo conversationis deperderet, insuper et rerum fratrum plura invitus expenderet." Ibid., (86): 361.

of food, drink, and ephemeral merriment. His escape unscathed is yet another proof of his sanctity.

iii. *Infiltration of the cloister*

Two other categories of laymen, guests and beggars, entered the monastic enclave as a matter of course, and their relations with the community must be examined. As monks themselves recognized, one of the most important social functions they performed was to care for the poor, pilgrims, and travelers.²⁶ Normally one-tenth of the monastery's income was set aside for the care of important visitors, and an additional one-ninth to care for the poor.²⁷ That such large amounts were budgeted shows that many must have taken advantage of monastic hospitality and alms, as does the space devoted to care of these classes of visitors in the customaries, the specific written regulations of each house that became common with the spread of specific reform practices in the tenth century.

Hospitality was plainly an awkward matter. The Benedictine Rule in its chapter on hospitality gives a confusing picture of how the monastery is to treat guests. At the beginning, monks are told to receive guests like Christ, but at the end the brethren are ordered not to speak to them. The chapter oscillates several times between these two extremes; on the one hand lies love of the rest of humanity, but on the other lurks fear of worldly influences.²⁸ These clear contradictions continued in full strength throughout the central middle

²⁶ As Othloh of St. Emmeram stated in the eleventh century in a defense of monasticism. See Othloh s. Emmerammi, *Liber de admonitione clericorum et laicorum*, PL 146, (1): 247. An admonition at the beginning of the Fleury customary reminds monks of their duty to serve all as Christ commanded. See *Consuetudines Floriacenses*, (12): 21; (14): 24–26 for care of poor people who come for alms or food to the abbey, and (13): 24 on dealing with guests. For a very good analysis, see Michel Mollat, "Les moines et les pauvres XI^e–XII^e siècles," in *Il monachesimo e la riforma ecclesiastica (1049–1122)*, Settimana Mendola 6 (1971), pp. 193–215.

²⁷ *Consuetudines Floriacenses*, (13): 24 for a clearly-stated example. See also Smaragdus' *Expositio in regulam s. Benedicti*, CCM 8 (1974), (III.53): 280; Hildemar, *Expositio Regulæ* (Regensburg, 1880), (53): 502–508 for the resources to be allotted to guests, and for their proper treatment. For analysis, see Willibrord Witters, "Pauvres et pauvreté dans les coutumes monastiques du moyen âge," in *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*, ed. Michel Mollat (Paris, 1974), pp. 177–216.

²⁸ RB 53. Adalbert de Vogüé examines this contradictory chapter in the last volume of the SC edition of the rule, the *Commentaire doctrinal et spirituel*, SC 186 (1977), pp. 360–63.

ages. The duty of caring for guests could not be escaped; in fact, the monks themselves accepted this commitment as a normal part of life, if not always without complaint. This duty was circumscribed, as was travel by monks, with many precautionary rules, though; careful lines were drawn to prevent most of the community from interacting with these emissaries of the outside world. Visitors would deal with the guestmaster and his servants; other monks were not even to speak with them without special permission.²⁹ Fleury's customary would not allow even the parents of a sick child living in the monastery to visit, so the future monk would not be confronted with the temptation of "carnal love."³⁰ The same tenth-century collection orders that no lay person can remain within the monastic enclave after Compline.³¹ As a whole, the document shows a deep suspicion of laypeople. A striking example is that the author warns the keeper of the church treasure not to let any layperson enter the treasury, nor to let such a person so much as touch "a divine vestment" (*aliquid divini paramenti*).³² In canon law, Burchard of Worms (d. 1025) also takes a firm stand against the entrance of the laity into a monastery. He goes as far as to assert that while the diocesan should visit monasteries frequently, he should bring no laypeople with him,³³ although a bishop's establishment in the tenth century would have included many such. Even when the laity were occasionally allowed into the cloister, the monks should take special care. These visitors should not be allowed contact with monks. Lanfranc (d. 1089) in his quite gentle and world-friendly *Monastic Constitutions* ordered that, if a layman wanted a tour of the monastery, the guide should choose a time to show him the

²⁹ In an elaboration of this rule, Lanfranc orders that if a visitor wants to speak to a monk, the guestmaster should take the request to the abbot or prior for approval. Lanfranc, *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, ed. David Knowles (New York, 1951), p. 87. This follows a long tradition. Columbanus had ordered penance for any monk who conversed with a layperson without specific orders to do so. Columbanus, *Regula Coenobialis*, in *Sancti Columbani opera*, ed. George S.M. Walker (Dublin, 1957), p. 160. Basil, usually much gentler than Columbanus and more concerned with the teaching role of monks, similarly ordered that only the superior of the monastery answer the questions of a guest. Basil, *The Long Rules*, in *Ascetical Works*, trans. M. Monica Wagner (Washington, D.C., 1962), (Q45): 322–23.

³⁰ "ut omnis occasio de monasterio pellatur carnalis dilectionis." *Consuetudines Floriacenses*, (18): 31.

³¹ *Ibid.*, (11): 20.

³² *Ibid.*, (8): 15.

³³ Burchardus, (VIII.53, 66): 803, 805–806. For more background, see Albert Königer, *Burchard I. von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit (1000–1025)* (Munich, 1905), p. 107.

cloister when the brethren were elsewhere, thus avoiding contact in the monks' private space.³⁴

As for the care of the poor, what could a cloistered monk know about their needs? There are interesting testimonies to how ignorant monks could be about the laity. They simply did not understand the needs of secular people. The *Consuetudines Floriacenses* orders that the guestmaster for the poor should, if possible, be a *conversus*, not a *nutritus*, that is a person, according to the terminology of the time, who entered the monastery as an adult rather than as a child oblate. As the compiler of this customary explains: "It should be done in this way, because one who is himself expert in such matters will have more compassion and humanity toward paupers and pilgrims than a *nutritus* of the place would, who is not at all conscious of such things."³⁵ Ignorance of conditions in the world was assumed as basic to most monks. It not only appears in the realm of hagiography, where saints are miracles of loving detachment, but also in simple legislation such as this customary from Fleury. Ignorance was the ideal in this matter, and one moreover that seemed within the grasp of the average monk.

As when dealing with the more important guests of the monastery, only designated officials were to provide for the needs of the paupers who came daily to the gate for alms.³⁶ In general, monks charged with the care of the poor did not leave the monastery, except in cases of weekly visits to the sick, a practice occasionally mentioned in later sources that may have also existed in the ninth and tenth centuries.³⁷ Even when the customs of a monastery allowed such visitations, they must have been extremely limited in scope.

³⁴ Lanfranc, p. 88.

³⁵ "Hoc autem idcirco, quia maioris compassionis atque humanitatis erga pauperes et peregrinos invenitur uti per semetipsum expertus rem quam loci nutritus, qui nichil sibi talium est conscius." *Consuetudines Floriacenses*, (14): 25.

³⁶ Ibid. The role of almsgiver is only attributed to the chamberlain and the abbot, exhorting both to be generous and humble in this function, (12): 21. In other monasteries, this was the duty of the almoner or provost.

³⁷ The earliest mention of monks performing regular care for the poor and infirm who were unable to get to the monastery for distributions is in a mid-eleventh century account, speaking of Abbot Ramwold of St. Emmeram, who died in 1001. Ramwold's practice of giving alms to such people was held up as extraordinary, especially since the abbot was not ashamed to carry a purse around with him (!), so he could give out alms with his own hands. Arnold s. Emmerammi, *Ex libris de s. Emmeranno duo*, MGH SS 4, (II.16): 562. A similar account is given regarding Abbot Benedict of Cluse in the late eleventh century. Willhelmus Clusensis, *Vita Benedicti abbatis Clusensis*, MGH SS 12, (7): 202. The issue of monks making weekly almsgiving visits is discussed briefly by Mollat, "Les moines," p. 202.

For example, Lanfranc in the mid-eleventh century made specific provision for the almoner of the monastery to go out and visit the poor and sick. This official was to take two servants with him on such ventures, perhaps to see that propriety was observed as much as to help him carry provisions. Even more restrictive, the almoner was firmly ordered to make all women leave any house he was visiting before he himself entered.³⁸ Clearly only male paupers and invalids could receive the spiritual comfort or alms of such a holy man, since the likelihood that temptation would result from any sort of contact with a woman was too great for him to run the risk.

The average monk of a well-run monastery would probably have had contact with the poor only in carefully controlled liturgical situations. Thus, for instance, there is very little about the poor in the *Regularis concordia* (the general outline of proper monastic custom promulgated for the monks and nuns of England at the synod of Winchester in c. 970), but an entire chapter dwells on the liturgical usage of the Maundy of the poor.³⁹ Monks were to wash the feet of the poor, not primarily for the sake of the poor themselves, but to reenact Christ's washing of the apostles' feet on Maundy Thursday. Twelve or thirteen poor men were typically chosen for the ceremony—for the liturgical symbolism of the number, not as a response to real needs. These paupers would have their feet washed by the monks, then they were fed and usually given a gift of money upon dismissal. The monks were to accompany the ceremony with psalmody, as had already been established by the ninth-century commentators on the Rule.⁴⁰ The paupers in such a ceremony, it seems plain, were symbols acted upon by the monks, not participants in any but the most passive way.⁴¹

³⁸ Lanfranc, p. 89.

³⁹ [Aethelwold?], *Regularis concordia Anglicae nationis monachorum sanctimonialiumque*, ed. and trans. Thomas Symons (London, 1953), (IV.40) 38–39. *Consuetudines Germaniae: Redactio Fuldensis-Trivirensis (F)*, ed. Maria Wegener and Candida Elvert, CCM 7,3, (25): 287 describes the regular washing of the feet of the poor. The editors date this work to the early eleventh century.

⁴⁰ Smaragdus, *Expositio*, (III.53): 280; Hildemar, (53): 508.

⁴¹ Witters discusses this tendency to what he calls the “sacralization of social service” in his thought-provoking article cited above. See especially p. 214 for the symbolism involved in such ceremonies; p. 200 for the place held by the poor in the Cluniac liturgy on fast days.

iv. *A foretaste of heaven*

The image that monks of the tenth century wished to present to the world and to themselves was thus one of separation from people more than from material objects. Accompanying that, I believe, monks in houses of good observance gradually acquired a view that such separation endowed them with moral superiority. In this respect, there is little difference between the various reformed directions. Cluniacs, Gorzians, even members of imperial houses that were not formally part of a reform group, were unanimous in their conviction that, despite its temporal possessions and interests, the monastery was not actually part of the world at all. Monks occupied a middle ground in this respect somewhere between the normal order of humanity and the angels.

To some extent, monks in their cloister were already past the troubles of the world and enjoying heavenly rest. For the monastic reformers of the tenth century, monasticism was considered the best possible re-creation of prelapsarian life on earth, a foretaste of paradise.⁴² Those are the terms of the century: the world, due to original sin, is a place of trouble, distraction, and temptation. It is only in heaven that existence is no longer a struggle, both against physical hardships and more importantly against the threat of damnation. Odo of Cluny, who provides the most detailed picture of monastic life from the tenth century, tells readers that monks participate in "eternal silence." He goes on to explain that peace is a prime attribute of monastic life.⁴³ Thus at once two separate, although related, images are set up in the minds of the readers. The first is the sense that monks are "dead" in some way to the world, and their profession seals them as servants of God. That monks believed this becomes plain upon glancing at customaries of the period. The ceremony of profession was intended to mark an irrevocable and awesome rite of passage. The newly professed monk finished the ceremony with three days of silence, with his head covered, to mark off his death to the world and rebirth to the monastic state, as well as to represent

⁴² See Jean Leclercq in "L'Idéal monastique de saint Odon, d'après ses œuvres," in *A Cluny* (Dijon, 1950), p. 231 on monks described as angels and the monastic life as a foretaste of Paradise.

⁴³ For this discussion, see especially Giles Constable, "Monachisme et pèlerinage au moyen âge" *RH* 258 (1977): 3-28.

symbolically Christ's death and resurrection.⁴⁴ The second image, that the monastery was equivalent either to the peace of heaven after death or the anticipated peace of the earth after the Second Coming, also plays a large role in the traditional monastic ideology as it was expressed in the tenth century. This peace was possible only because of the degree of separation monks enjoyed from the experiences of the rest of society. Monastic leaders did their best to emphasize this separation, and the spread of comparisons of the monastery to the heavenly Jerusalem shows the degree of their success.⁴⁵

Monks were members of a very special sort of community. The monastery, as monastic writers emphasized especially in the tenth century, was a revitalization of the primitive state of the Church. For writers like Odo of Cluny, monks lived a life like that of the apostles. Their goal and purpose was prayer for the world and its sadly twisted inhabitants, and to do this effectively they needed to avoid contamination from those for whom they prayed. But the apostolic life, the model of the primitive Church, was very carefully limited and defined: the model was the apostolic community described in Acts 2.44–45, in which the apostles shared all their goods and lived together "with one heart." Monks imitated apostles by owning no private property and living in a tightly-knit social body. This was one of the most defining characteristics of monks. Odo describes monasticism in just such terms, that monks are men who are bound by common life.⁴⁶ Almost the only references made to apostles in

⁴⁴ For profession as a second baptism, see Joachim Wollasch, "Das Mönchgelübde als Opfer" *FMSI* 18 (1984): 525. For analysis of the social conditions that made this idea possible, see Edward E. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr: The Monk as the Successor of the Martyr* (Washington, D.C., 1950), pp. 121ff.

⁴⁵ As early as the mid ninth century, Smaragdus of St. Mihiel explained that psalmody, if chanted with a pure heart, is like singing with the angels. Smaragdus, *Diadema monachorum*, PL 102, (2): 597. In c. 1021 Fulbert of Chartres referred to Abbot Odilo of Cluny as "that holy archangel of monks." Fulbert of Chartres, *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends (Oxford, 1976), #64, p. 108. Kassius Hallinger, "The Spiritual Life of Cluny in the Early Days," in *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Noreen Hunt (London, 1971), pp. 3–41. This analysis of early Cluniac spirituality, for want of evidence from the Empire, points out that to be a monk is an anticipation of the life to come, and that monks are angelic while still on earth, participating in the "eternal silence" of heaven. An interesting artistic example is the eleventh-century chandelier of the monastery of Groß Comburg near Schwäbisch Hall. Hung in the center of the monastic church, it is a full representation of the heavenly Jerusalem.

⁴⁶ Odo Cluniacensis, *Occupatio*, ed. Antonius Swoboda (Leipzig, 1900), (VI): 135–36. Leclercq considers that the *Occupatio* contains Odo's clearest statements on the monastic state. Leclercq, "L'Idéal monastique," pp. 227–28. Wollasch discusses this

monastic works of this period comment on this commitment to common life; they almost completely ignore the aspect of apostles as those "sent out," as their very name means in Greek. For these monks, to be apostolic does not carry with it any implications of evangelization or other activity in the world outside of the cloister. Instead, the monastic community fulfills a longing for solitude and a safe place to protect themselves against the dangers of the rest of the world.

By the tenth century, the bonds of community within the monastery, always strong, are visible in the literature as a central concern of monastic life. There was a reviving sense of at least this side of the primitive Church; ideally the community of monks, either of a particular house or the world-community of monks, was dedicated to a common struggle for righteousness. Thus the author of the customary of Fleury describes monks as fighting in common against the enemies of the faith, in other words demons, acting as did the primitive Church.⁴⁷ The community was the monastery, a select few who had been set apart from the cares and temptations of the world; it could certainly not be equated to the world itself.

Tenth-century reforms strengthened the tendency to celestialize the monastery, to treat it as a foretaste of heaven, as monastic leaders tried to reassert the basic separateness of monks from secular society. The reforms also had important implications for the ways in which monks understood their community. The monastic life was considered at two different levels: there was both the monastic solidarity of each individual community, and a growing awareness of the unity of all monks as members of a single *ordo*, a unified way of life that stood in sharp contrast to other sectors of society. Thus while reformers took several steps to strengthen each monastery's sense of community, they frequently developed inter-monastic bonds that stressed the ties between wide confederations of monasteries. This was only an apparent conflict of goals; both trends focused on monasticism as an institution that existed in well-defined separation from the world.

Such developments laid the groundwork for future debate on monastic practice in the eleventh century, when monasteries became better

passage as part of Odo's plans for the renewal of Christian life following a monkish model. Joachim Wollasch, *Mönchtum des Mittelalters zwischen Kirche und Welt* (Munich, 1973), pp. 147–48.

⁴⁷ *Consuetudines Floriacenses*, (prologue): 8.

known to each other. Writers could speak of *proper* Benedictine observance as part of a single, identifiable super-community, rather than "the observance at my monastery." Monasticism as a whole was a single entity, or if it were not, there would be many eyes to see and complain about anything that seemed "irregular," and to enforce conformity. With this development of a monastic *ordo*, the available sources suggest that the quality of life at one monastery was perceived as reflecting on the entire monastic institution. A monk was a monk, whether he belonged to a community in northern France or central Italy. The establishment of formal connections between monks of different houses was a concrete recognition of this accepted fact. The best-known example of inter-monastic ties is that of Cluny, a federation of monasteries linked by the leadership of a single abbot; similar federations were also formed in imperial territory.⁴⁸

Monks were a militia, fighting in God's service against supernatural forces. This is in part a clear demonstration of the warlike mentality of the early middle ages; even monks were engaged in war, although of a spiritualized sort.⁴⁹ Thus the metaphor of monasticism as a militia was very powerful in eleventh-century Cluniac writing, especially in the time of Abbot Odilo, but was treated conservatively and metaphorically, rather than suggesting a real army of monks fighting for a cause.⁵⁰ What one frequently overlooks is the vivid image of a militia as a group of people acting in community. Monks needed the support of their brethren, as we have seen. Only the spiritual giants, the few who were strong enough to move on to the life of a recluse or hermit, engaged in single combat.⁵¹

It is necessary to emphasize that, as Benedict himself asserted in

⁴⁸ For an overview of this issue, see Marcel Pacaut, "Structures monastiques, Société et Église en Occident aux XI^e-XII^e siècles" *Cahiers d'histoire* 20 (1975): 123.

⁴⁹ See Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression" *Viator* 2 (1971): 129-57.

⁵⁰ Otto G. Oexle, "Die funktionale Dreiteilung der 'Gesellschaft' bei Adalbero von Laon. Deutungsschemata der sozialen Wirklichkeit im früheren Mittelalter" *FMSI* 12 (1978): 22.

⁵¹ One of many examples of the depiction of monks as a sacred militia is Odo of Cluny's happy boast: "What king or emperor has ever commanded such a great army through so many lands as Benedict's monks?" Odo Cluniacensis, *Sermo III*, PL 133: 729. Less common in this period was the description of a monastery as a *scola* (usually translated as "school") for God's service, as it is described in the RB pro.45. But *scola* also has the legal meaning of a group of people acting together, under which the image of soldiers can easily fit. See Karl Frank, "Vom Kloster als scola dominici servitii zum Kloster ad servitium imperii" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 91 (1980): 83.

his Rule, the traditional monastic view was that this combat should take place *within the monastery*.⁵² The communal nature of the battle being fought helps to point to the fact that it is a spiritual struggle that is under discussion. These monastic theorists are suggesting that monks are engaged in activities that combat the forces of evil and make the world a better place for everyone, not just monks. Such a struggle, however, does not call for active, physical engagement with people in the world. Rather the monks' purpose is a combination of resistance to the demonic forces so active in the world, and intercessory prayer to God.

⁵² At the end of the instruments of good works, Benedict reminds the reader that the place to do any of these good works "is the enclosure of the monastery and stability in the community." RB 4.78.

CHAPTER TWO

MISSIONARIES AND NEW MONASTIC DREAMS

For most monks, life remained a communal, ritual fight against the forces of evil. Nevertheless, in the second half of the tenth century, more evidence begins to appear of interest in monks' individual endeavor. While this gradually resulted in a new individualism in the way humans related to God, culminating in the mysticism of the late middle ages, of interest for this study is each individual's desire to wage active battle for God. In other words, for some monks, prayer within the monastic enclosure was no longer regarded as a sufficient way to serve God in the world. Instead, physical appearance outside of the cloister—teaching, preaching, serving as an example—appears to have attracted some individuals. Such aspirations effectively drew them from the anonymous community of holiness to recognizable personal endeavor.

The first clear signs of this turn toward the world appear in descriptions of German and Italian missionaries to the Slavic lands in the wake of Ottonian conquests, and to Hungary. I chose the case of Wolfgang of Regensburg in the introduction because he spans both extremes of missionary activity: he was the first known missionary to Hungary, and his eleventh-century supporters give the most comprehensive justification of activity outside of the cloister that I have found. As I suggested in the introduction, the strength of the apologia suggests that Wolfgang was not unique, and that at least by the 1030's there were visible, outspoken critics of monks interacting with secular people in this manner. On the missionary front, perhaps more than any other, we can begin to see the tension as monks explored the meaning of "love of neighbor."¹

Engagement in missionary work inevitably raised the issue of whether or not preaching was an acceptable activity for a monk. In the twelfth century, this question would be addressed in terms of the

¹ There has been a long debate over whether monks were involved in missionary work in the tenth century or not. I believe that the evidence is incontestable that they were indeed present, and in significant numbers. Please refer to the literature cited throughout this chapter.

relationship of monks to *cura animae* (care of souls). We must be careful, though, not to read this back into the tenth and eleventh centuries. Especially in the German Empire where monks came from the nobility, the very idea of such lowly service hardly came into question. Monks rarely even served in churches owned by their own monasteries.² Public preaching, on the other hand, was well within the realm of attractive tasks for a monk who was concerned about spreading the Christian faith. Abbots had long had the right to preach in public, as can be seen from as early as the sixth-century *vita* of Benedict of Nursia;³ it was a mark of their rank and prestige rather than of the humble status of a country parson. The spread of missionary interest among the monks of the late tenth century thus moved more from the abbots' preaching function than from the pastoral care of parish clergy. While few people contested the preaching rights of abbots, the spread of preaching rights to simple monks, such as Wolfgang, was a very different matter. In the extant sources from the ninth and tenth centuries, it is almost always abbots and saints whom chroniclers describe as "spreading the word of God" or counseling laity in the area around a monastery; for example, their hagiographers describe John of Gorze, Kaddroe, and Odo of Cluny all as spiritual directors and preachers.⁴ Mentions of simple, non-sainted

² On the social rank of monks compared to that of parish clergy, see Friedrich Kempf, "Die päpstliche Gewalt in der mittelalterlichen Welt," in *Saggi Storici intorno al papato* (Rome, 1959), p. 166. There is a long historiography on this question. There is some evidence that monks were gradually forced out of pastoral care in the years around 750, because of increasingly strict adherence to the Benedictine Rule. For Charlemagne's efforts to end the role of monks as pastoral caregivers, see Arnold Angenendt, *Monachi Peregrini. Studien zu Pirmin und den monastischen Vorstellungen des frühen Mittelalters* (Munich, 1972), p. 163; Jean-François Lemarignier, "Encadrement religieux des campagnes et conjoncture politique dans les régions du royaume de France situés au nord de la Loire, de Charles le Chauve aux derniers Carolingiens," in *Christianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medioevo*, Settimana Spoleto 28 (1982), 1: 767. Before the twelfth century there is very little concrete evidence of monks filling parish offices, and the situation was almost certainly exceptional. Normally monasteries that owned churches would appoint secular clerics to staff them. See Giles Constable, "Monasteries, Rural Churches and the *Cura animarum* in the Early Middle Ages," in *Christianizzazione*, p. 370.

³ Gregory the Great, *Dialogues*, Book 2: *Saint Benedict*, trans. Myra L. Uhlfelder (Indianapolis, 1967), (8): 18.

⁴ Iohannes s. Arnulfi, *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis*, MGH SS 4, (49) 351, relating events before he became abbot, but in the aura of sanctity; Reimannus, sive Ousmannus, *Vita Cadroe abbate*, AASS Mart. I, (32) 479, where he is said to have the "spirit of counsel" (*spiritum consilii*); John of Salerno, *Life of Odo of Cluny*, in *St. Odo of Cluny*, ed. and trans. Gerard Sitwell (London, 1958), (I.36): 38, in which Odo, while still a monk, counsels a woman he has introduced to the religious life.

monks preaching are extremely rare. One, named Adalbert, is mentioned in the *vita* of Gerald of Aurillac as “that same monk who preaches the word of God to the people at Limoges.”⁵ While the canonist Burchard of Worms (fl. 1008–1012) allows the right of monks to preach if they are ordained priests,⁶ even as late as the 1060’s a learned and famous monk like Othloh of St. Emmeram’s could protest when requested to give the public sermon at Easter (apparently an annual event at the monastery) that he had never spoken in public before.⁷

i. *The imperial mission*

From the extant sources one can reconstruct that monks were systematically drafted, especially from Gorzian reformed houses, for relocation on the frontiers. More complicated is the question of whether these monks performed mission work. From the brief references available, it seems likely that this was the case for much of the tenth century. For example, the mission sent out by the ambitious Bishop Pilgrim of Passau lasted a very short time, but is interesting for the clear view it gives of the monks’ role in the work of conversion. In a letter to Pope Benedict VI in 973, Pilgrim claims that five thousand noble Hungarians had been baptized already by his emissaries. He tells how, although he was unable to go to Hungary himself, “Still I sent them enough suitable men from the ranks of monks and canons, priests and clerics of the various grades of the Church, and thus organized their life and their behavior. . . .”⁸ It is noteworthy that monks received first billing in this letter, and the language suggests that monks as much as canons were engaged in the actual work of conversion. In other words, it was a situation so much taken for granted that no explanations needed to be given. Monks did what they were told, and little was made of it.

⁵ Odo Cluniacensis, *Life of Gerald of Aurillac*, in *St. Odo of Cluny*, ed. and trans. Gerard Sitwell, (I.39): 128.

⁶ Burchardus Wormaciensis, *Decretorum libri XX*, PL 140, (II.158): 651–652, (XIX.142): 1010. One should note that it was only in the twelfth century that the right to preach became a standard attachment to priestly ordination. See Caroline Walker Bynum, *Jesus as Mother* (Berkeley, 1982), p. 31.

⁷ Othloh s. Emmerammi, *Libellus de suis tentationibus*, PL 146, (II): 55.

⁸ *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*, vol. 1, ed. Gustavus Friedrich (Prague, 1904–1907), #33, p. 37.

After the Northumbrian missions of the eighth century, little evidence exists before the year 970 that anyone, including monks, felt any great desire to conduct missionary work, except for rulers trying to use Christianity to extend their influence in new territories.⁹ The early history of the Slavic and Magyar mission is one of grudging acquiescence to superior authority, not of missionary zeal. Evangelizing was not popular work, at least not until the years from around 970 on. A letter of Archbishop Wilhelm of Mainz gives a clear example of the low esteem in which it was held. He wrote to the pope in c. 960 that he would rather be sent as a preacher to the heathen than to see his church dishonored; obviously he was using mission to the pagans as one of the most unpleasant things he could think of, to lend force to his argument.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it would have been nearly impossible to refuse a royal command to enter the missionary field.

A poignant view of how disagreeable and dangerous monks could perceive such a command to be can be found in the monk Adalbert of Magdeburg's account of his appointment as missionary bishop to Kiev by Otto I. This mission shows very clearly both the importance of missionary work to imperial politics and the central role of monasteries in providing the necessary manpower. The Russian princess Olga sent to Otto I asking for a bishop and priests for her people. Otto, probably concerned about a possible alliance between Russia and the Byzantine Church, an alignment that actually occurred soon after, quickly appointed the monk Libutius of St. Alban's in Mainz as bishop for the Russians. He was consecrated on Christmas in 959. Libutius died in February of 961, however, before he had ever left Germany, the length of elapsed time perhaps in itself a sign of how unwilling he was to go.¹¹ So Adalbert, a monk of St. Maximin's, Trier, one of the most influential centers of the Gorzian reform, was selected to succeed Libutius as missionary bishop to Kiev.

⁹ Zdenek R. Dittrich in *Christianity in Great-Moravia* (Groningen, 1962), pp. 42ff. argues that the Irish were active in the western mission to Moravia in the ninth century, but on very slim evidence.

¹⁰ Cited by Walter Schlesinger, *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens im Mittelalter* (Cologne/Graz, 1962), 1: 26.

¹¹ Regino Prümensis, *Chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol. [a. 961], p. 170; discussed in Heinrich Büttner, "Die christliche Kirche ostwärts der Elbe bis zum Tode Ottos I," in *FS für Friedrich von Zahn*, ed. Walter Schlesinger (Cologne/Graz, 1968), p. 163; Dietrich Claude, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg bis in das 12. Jahrhundert* (Cologne/Vienna, 1972), p. 77.

Adalbert, who later became archbishop of Magdeburg, has left us an intensely personal view of his selection in the continuation he wrote to the ninth-century chronicle of Regino of Prüm.¹² He perceived his assignment quite frankly as an unearned punishment rather than as an honor. The unwilling missionary blamed his choice on the machinations of Archbishop Wilhelm of Mainz, "although he [Adalbert] had expected better of him, and had never deserved anything of the sort from him." Adalbert did not long for martyrdom or even to share his monastic virtues with others, and was happy to get away from Russia when he discovered on arrival that the political climate had changed and he was no longer welcome. He was back in Germany by 962, and a few years later was elected abbot of Weissenburg, perhaps as reward for his involuntary efforts in the imperial service. Soon after that, he was selected as first archbishop of Magdeburg.¹³

The very paucity of information about the large number of monasteries established along the borders causes suspicion. A long list of monks can be found who were consecrated as missionary bishops, along with monastic foundations. Such a large phenomenon made such a small impact on historiography (written by monks) that they barely even touch on the erection of the bishoprics of Prague and Moravia, both missions probably led by monks.¹⁴ It seems impossible that monks from areas such as Regensburg could have been completely ignorant of what was going on around them. But in the tenth

¹² See Joseph Werra, *Über den Continuator Reginonis* (Leipzig, 1883), for the identification of Adalbert with the anonymous Continuator Reginonis. See especially pp. 90–91.

¹³ "licet meliora in eum confisus fuerit et nihil umquam in eum deliquerit..." Regino Prümensis [a. 961 and 962], pp. 170–72. Adalbert's mission, despite its complete lack of practical results, attracted wide attention. Accounts of it appear in *Annales Quedlinburgensis*, MGH SS 3 [a. 960], p. 60; *Annales Ottenburani*, MGH SS 5 [a. 960], p. 4; and Lampertus Hersfeldensis, *Annales*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol. [a. 960], p. 38. The mission is discussed in Claude, 1: 114–16; Robert Holtzmann, *Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit (900–1024)* (Munich, 1941 (reprint ed. 1967)), pp. 187–88. In relation to travel more generally see Heinrich Fichtenau, "Reisen und Reisende," in his *Beiträge zur Mediävistik* (Stuttgart, 1986) 3: 26. Olga was forced to resign her power to her pagan son Svyatoslav, probably before Adalbert ever reached Kiev. See Francis Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, 2nd ed. (Gulf Breeze, Florida, 1974), p. 69.

¹⁴ Heinrich Büttner, "Erzbischof Willigis von Mainz und das Papsttum bei der Bistumserrichtung in Böhmen und Mähren im 10. Jh." *RhVj* 30 (1965): 2, points out that we know very little about tenth-century evangelical aspirations compared to other religious or secular matters of the time.

century monks, the successors of Benedict of Aniane, give such small amounts of information that one cannot help but speculate why. The reason appears clear. These monk-bishops and monasteries had been created to advance Christianity into the pagan border lands. The chroniclers, however, spark the suspicion that this use of monasticism was eyed with disapproval, and so did not deem it worthy material for their chronicles. Even well into the eleventh century authors well situated to know about the eastern mission do not care to discuss it.¹⁵ It seems very likely that a segment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy looked askance at the use of stable, supposedly secluded monks as missionaries. Bishops, even popes, had to acquiesce in the schemes of the Ottonian dynasty, but that did not mean they had to like it.

As a result, the activities of probably most tenth-century missionaries are shrouded in mystery. Nevertheless, there are hints of a transition from imperial to personal mission. One can see this for Bruno, or Prunwart, who appears to have been the first monk to undertake the work of conversion voluntarily. He was a monk of St. Gall who went to Hungary in 972. According to the necrology of his home monastery, Bruno was responsible for converting many Hungarians, including the ruler, Prince Géza. We know little more about this missionary. He was a consecrated bishop, but there is no reason to believe that he had a fixed see.¹⁶ Another source supplies a hint

¹⁵ Thietmar, bishop of Merseburg, has little to say about mission work. Haendler points this out as a sign of the paucity of eastern bishops willing to conduct mission. He also attributes it to a state of tension between the goals of the imperial mission, which was responsible for the early monk-missionaries, and the ecclesiastical system of bishoprics and hierarchies that were insulted by claims on "their" land. See Gert Haendler, "Reichskirche und Mission in der ersten Epoche der Christianisierung Mecklenburgs (bis 1066)," in *Kirche und Gesellschaft im Ostseeraum und im Norden vor der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Visby, 1969), p. 68. Rodulfus Glaber specifically states that in the early eleventh century the barbarians of the north and west became Christian, but says he has not heard of similar conversion in the east and south. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford, 1989), (I.24): 40–42. Claude, p. 75 also points out that the Corvey monks appear to have been against the Slav mission, an interesting point since they were almost the only supporters of mission to the north in the ninth century.

¹⁶ *Necrologia Germaniae*, ed. Franciscus Baumann, MGH *Necrologiae* 1: 466. A copy of the letter to Pilgrim may be found in *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, MGH *Epist. Selectae* 3, (II. #96): 100–1. This appears to argue against the suggestion that this less famous Bruno was sent out by Pilgrim, as stated by Holtzmann, pp. 264–65; and Ignaz Zibermayr, *Noricum Baiern und Österreich*, 2nd ed. (Horn, 1956), p. 379. I have found no evidence to connect Bruno with the diocese of Verden, as Csóka does in J. Lajos Csóka, *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums in Ungarn*, *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 24 (1980): 30.

that Bruno acted at least partly on his own initiative. Emperor Otto (either I or II) supplied him with a letter of protection, asking Bishop Pilgrim of Passau to help Bruno get to Hungary. This suggests that he was not part of Pilgrim's own missionary efforts in that region, or was only superficially attached to that ambitious prelate. At the same time, the letter does not suggest a close alliance with the Ottonians.

Our information about monk-missionaries, usually in the form of accounts defending their activities, comes well after the events, as in the case of Wolfgang of Regensburg. Did German monks, almost certainly the compilers of these accounts, enter into defense as early as Wolfgang's mission in the 970's, and regard at least missionary work, if not other forms of service in the world, as laudable by c. 1000? Or was the attitude still amorphous in the time of King Stephen of Hungary? At that time the sources show monks acting as missionaries without much comment, either positive or negative. Authors discussing Stephen and his religious policy display no need to justify the activities of their heroes. More simply, they sometimes show missionaries acting at the behest of superior authority. Perhaps it is the case that these monastic/missionary activities were only later criticized as part of a larger phenomenon of the wandering monk, and in turn idealized into a more comprehensive defense of the monk in the world. While the evidence for a shift in attitude beginning in the second half of the tenth century will be examined at length in the next chapters, in order to understand these accounts of monk missionaries it is necessary to make a few important points.

Most extant accounts of voluntary monk-missionaries can be linked to groups that were already noted for internal monastic reform in the Empire in the tenth century. A development from reform of fellow monks to conversion of pagans is not as great a leap as a sudden turnabout from no involvement in affairs at all to active evangelization. One should note, however, that the monks who became involved in mission and church organization of the new lands did so as individuals, not as groups. Evidence is lacking for a monasticism whose prime purpose, or even a major purpose, was avowedly mission. The connection with the reform movement is that changing conditions within monasticism, and especially the way the monks interpreted their relationships with and obligations toward the world, had made it *possible* for the phenomenon of the monk-missionary to exist and even to be admired by the society that created him. It is of course one thing to have a monk act as a missionary and another

to proclaim brazenly that this action is not only necessary, but good for the soul of the monk. Certainly by the time Wolfgang's defenders wrote, beginning in 1037 at the latest, evangelization was finding at least a few strong advocates within monastic circles.

It is also important to note the very practical side to this turn toward mission. If monks had not been forced willy-nilly into interacting with pagans, this growing concern with Christian obligation might have taken a very different form. Without the support and protection of sympathetic rulers, missionaries would very probably have been much rarer, and there would have been few tales of brilliant success to inspire those at home. This becomes clear by comparing the situation in central Europe with that in Islamic lands in the same period, where authorities actively discouraged Christian preaching.¹⁷ The imperially-sponsored mission did much to spread knowledge of the pagans in the east and to implant a desire to work for their conversion. It prepared the ground for a new missionary movement that was based firmly on the religious beliefs and sense of duty of its propagators. At the same time that the intense drive toward mission inspired by Otto I began to wane, there arose a new impulse toward voluntary mission efforts by the monks themselves. Several extraordinary missionary efforts took place in the 970's, and missionaries show considerable initiative to launch their work for reasons other than imperial pressure.

Perhaps the most extraordinary phenomenon in the monastic spread to central and eastern Europe is the gradual evidence of a change in attitude among monks themselves toward missionary endeavors. In the course of the tenth century evangelizing gradually became a subject of great enthusiasm by both monks and laity, after being unpopular in the early part of the century. What happened? Several historians have suggested that the monks of the Gorzian reform circle were always more open to the world than their counterparts in Burgundy, and it was upon these monks that the Ottonians drew most heavily.¹⁸ To explain the monks' appropriation of missionary work as part of

¹⁷ See Benjamin Z. Kedar, *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims* (Princeton, 1984), passim.

¹⁸ See Friedrich Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis des Ruotger: Ihre historiographische und ideengeschichtliche Stellung* (Bonn, 1958), p. 37; Augustin Fliche, *La Réforme grégorienne* (Louvain/Paris, 1924/1926) 1: 74. On the other hand, Georg Schreiber, *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters. Recht und Verfassung, Kult und Frömmigkeit* (Regensburg/Münster, 1948), p. 297 says Gorze turned against care of the sick and dying.

their own self-identity, however, one must postulate a dialectic between imperial coercion and monastic acquiescence. The monks actually *were* missionaries, whether willingly or not. It thus became important for them to justify such a high level of involvement in secular affairs, in the face of a tradition that focused on monks leading an isolated life of prayer. I suggest at greater length elsewhere that they did this by a variety of means, but especially through the search for authoritative texts to counter the current interpretation of the Benedictine Rule.¹⁹ They did not create new arguments but, true to the time, sought ancient authority to support their views. Thus, the educational impetus of both the Carolingian and Ottonian reforms bore fruit in new interpretations of both the Bible and the works of patristic authors.

The search for justification is borne out by the fact that the first evidence in support of monks as missionaries comes from the writings of monks themselves, rather than from the secular clergy, who may have felt threatened by the activity of the monks. It is in monastic work, mostly hagiographical, that we can trace a growing enthusiasm for mission. Reluctance to be involved in mission, so clear in Adalbert of Magdeburg's case, disappeared from view in the late tenth century. Tales of voluntary ventures into the mission field began to replace the disinterest and distaste for mission of the first half of the century. These accounts express a new interest in mission as a Christian duty. The fact that monks are writing these accounts, with a notable absence of similar accounts from the ranks of the secular clergy, and especially the appearance of hagiographical defenses of monastic actions, suggest their need to explain themselves, to an audience of secular clergy and other monks who were dubious or critical.

Since monks were in fact performing the function of missionaries, they had to be able to justify that involvement in some way. Often one can detect resentment and self-justification among the small scraps of information extant from what must have been a very important evangelical organization. The detractors employed traditional complaints of wayward monks, drawing on scripture and the Benedictine Rule, especially delighting in calling the missionaries gyrovagues (the alter ego of the hermit, supposed holy men who, instead of remaining in one place, wander around without spiritual guidance) or sara-

¹⁹ Phyllis G. Jestice, "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel" *Viator* 24 (1993): 51-78.

baites (those whom Benedict of Nursia considered a near parody of true monks, since sarabaites lived in groups, but without leader or rules of conduct, and often traveled freely).²⁰

ii. *Wenceslas of Bohemia and changing monastic ideals*

Other monastic literary sources in the years around 970 began to emphasize evangelization and the high duty of converting the pagans. An important set of documents illuminating the monks' changing attitude toward mission are the *vitae* of St. Wenceslas, duke of Bohemia from 921 until his martyrdom, probably in 929. These *vitae* were produced, probably by Bavarian monks, in the 970's and 980's.²¹ They give a fascinating picture both of actual monastic involvement in pagan lands and the way monks interpreted such work.

These *vitae* of Wenceslas, written by Germans who were almost certainly monks, appeared in the years 974 to 983. They have little to do with the historical duke of Bohemia, who was apparently murdered by his brother Boleslas, the loser in a power struggle, as Bohemian sources tell us. What the *vitae* do instead is to create a model for the symbiosis of monk and prince working on the frontier. They endow Wenceslas with all possible virtues. Thus, one of these *vitae* tells that the young ruler was very pious. Particularly praised is his care for the poor, pilgrims, "priests, clerics, and monks." Other examples of his virtues were that he imitated a monastic way of life, wearing wool next to his skin even though he was forced by his rank to wear royal robes on top, participating in divine offices, even preserving the night silence demanded of Benedictines.²² In the end, Wenceslas was killed for his Christian convictions. The same Latin *vita* tells that even his own mother turned against him: "What should we do," as the hagiographer has her speak, "since he who ought to

²⁰ RB 1.6–9.

²¹ Josef Staber, "Die Missionierung Böhmens durch die Bischöfe und das Domkloster von Regensburg im 10. Jahrhundert," in *Regensburg und Böhmen*, ed. Georg Schwaiger and Staber (Regensburg, 1972), p. 29; see also Heinrich Jilek, "Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts. Neuere Forschungsergebnisse" *ZS für Ostforschung* 24 (1975): 79–148.

²² *Vita et passio s. Wenceslai, et sancte Ludmille uxoris eius*, in Josef Pekař, *Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians* (Prague, 1906), (6): 108–109. For a basic history of Wenceslas, see A.P. Vlasto, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 94–96.

be prince has been perverted by the clerics, and is instead a monk?"²³

The authors of these Latin *vitae*, probably monks at St. Emmeram's, Regensburg, were from one of the German monastic reform circles.²⁴ As the reader can see, these western monks were quick to reformulate Wenceslas' death, which, historically speaking, was most probably caused by his brother's ambition and general discontent with the duke's growing alliance with Germany.²⁵ These Latin accounts of Wenceslas' life and death emphasize the monastic element to the point that some episodes in the *vitae* sound ridiculous to modern ears, such as Wenceslas wearing coarse wool under his fine clothing. All sources agree on Wenceslas' love of learning, but beyond that the authors appear to have been able to imagine anything they wished.²⁶ They give an astonishing picture of what life was like in Bohemia at the beginning of the tenth century, a picture that is probably false in most of its particulars, but extremely revealing about the aspirations and beliefs of the German monks themselves. According to these western authors, Wenceslas, to be truly generous and Christian, had to be generous to monks. It is unlikely, though, that the historical Wenceslas saw many monks, since the first monastery was not founded in Bohemian territory until c. 990. This suggests that the authors were looking to their own time and practices. In the opinion of these hagiographers, Wenceslas also had to act like a monk. The saintly duke took on all the ideal characteristics of Benedictine monks, including

²³ "Heu, quid agimus, quove nosmet vertemus? Princeps siquidem noster, qui a nobis in regni fastigio sublimatus est, perversus a clericis et ceu monachus factus . . ." *Vita et passio s. Wenceslai*, (5): 103; analysis in Staber, "Missionierung Böhmens," pp. 35–36.

²⁴ Ferdinand Seibt, "Der heilige Herzog Wenzel," in *Lebensbilder zur Geschichte der böhmischen Länder*, ed. Seibt (Munich/Vienna, 1981), p. 15. Bishop Gumpoldus of Mantua wrote his *Vita Wenzeslavi* in c. 983 at Otto II's request. MGH SS 4: 211–23. But the Latin legend known as "Crescente fide" from its opening words is older than Gumpoldus' account. It was written by a monk of St. Emmeram between 974 and 983. See Josef Staber, "Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des Fürsten Wenzeslaus und ihr Ursprungsort Regensburg," in *Das heidnische und christliche Slaventum*, ed. Franz Zagiba (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp. 183–85. Jilek, on the contrary, suggests that this *vita* was written shortly before Wenceslas' canonization in the late 1070's. Jilek, *passim*. I have accepted Staber's interpretation on the basis of his more comprehensive argument, the style of the work, and Staber's long-established reputation as a historian of central Europe.

²⁵ See Vlasto, pp. 95–96; Friedrich Prinz, *Böhmen im mittelalterlichen Europa: Frühzeit, Hochmittelalter, Kolonisations Epoche* (Munich, 1984), p. 68; Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization* (Boston, 1956), p. 106.

²⁶ For a comparison of the old-Slavic and Latin legends of Wenceslas, see Seibt, "Der heilige Herzog Wenzel," pp. 12–15.

a very monastic lifestyle and a mildness which, we are told, even led to him ordering the destruction of all the gallows in his land.²⁷

The Latin *vitae* of Wenceslas clearly reflect that at least their authors were thinking differently about the society around them than monks appear to have been, or at least have seen fit to write about, in the Anianian tradition. There is no longer a simple black and white confrontation of monks versus everyone else in the world. These texts show a transitional phase between a monastic ideal of isolation and one more concerned with the world around the monastery. The picture drawn in them is puzzling and conflicting, since the authors try to show both worlds at once: the world that allows holy laypeople to exist and the old world, in which almost all saints were monks, and monks are without doubt the pinnacle of society. The *vitae* present Wenceslas as a saint, although he was a layman. At the same time, though, these hagiographers burdened Wenceslas with such a weight of monastic values and practices that it would have been impossible for him to have functioned as a ruler. He is depicted as trying to live a life of ascetic retreat, but the authors also show this monk-duke as vitally concerned in the conversion and perfection of his land. They show him longing for martyrdom and simultaneously yearning for the conversion of his fellow Slavs.

To this extent, although they do not deal actively with monk-missionaries, these *vitae* reveal a changing interpretation of holy life. Reformers were extending the boundaries of what it meant to be a monk, or perhaps creating a gray area of "deeply concerned pious Christians" that could include characters such as Wenceslas almost on a level with the monks themselves. They contain many of the elements included in accounts of monk-evangelists, most notably the longing for martyrdom in both its narrow sense of death and in its wider meaning of "witness." These German hagiographers created a prince after their own image. He is clearly a mythical beast, but this odd marriage of monasticism and lay involvement on the Slavic frontier could have appeared in the first place only because it reflects some level of monastic interest in the world. As such, it is a valuable reflection on late tenth-century attitudes toward Christian society. Three *vitae* within a period of nine years was surely excessive for German monks writing about a foreign ruler. What caught their imagination about this "martyrdom?"

²⁷ Gumpoldus, (7): 215; see Prinz, *Böhmen*, pp. 69–70.

When considered closely, the story of the unfortunate Duke Wenceslas of Bohemia, killed in his youth for trying to advance the ways of God in a land that was not yet ready for them, was an ideal example of the struggle to bring a people into accordance with God's will. The twelfth-century chronicler Cosmas of Prague described the two brothers, Wenceslas and Boleslas, in these terms: "Wenceslas, acceptable to God and to men, and Boleslas, the execrable fratricide," but the comparison must have been just as obvious to tenth-century readers or hearers.²⁸ Wenceslas was a modern Abel, butchered by his evil brother Cain. The lesson, in an age permeated with Augustine's idea of the City of God and the City of Man, was plain. Wenceslas, the mild, monastic seeker after God, fell to the dagger of his own ambitious and pagan brother. But Wenceslas was not a monk; he was simply a pious young man who longed for his own salvation and that of his subjects. The City of God was not to be found only in a monastery, but could possibly be created on earth, as Wenceslas had been attempting when struck down by his brother. All that was needed was fertile ground and the right tools.

iii. *The new language of mission*

It was in this generation that increasing numbers of monks decided that, like Wenceslas, they were the chosen tools for the work of spreading God's kingdom on earth. Or at least that is the model their hagiographers present to future generations. What these authors describe is not the world as it was, but as they wanted it to become and hoped it could become through the efforts of their reforming circle. In this sense, the Wenceslas *vitae* show many similarities to Odo of Cluny's *vita* of Gerald of Aurillac; a layperson could help realize the kingdom of God on earth, but only when firmly directed by monastic wisdom and monastic ways of life.²⁹ In the *vitae* of Wenceslas,

²⁸ "Wencezlaum Deo et hominibus acceptabilem et Bolezlaum fraterna cede execrabilem." Cosmas Pragensis, *Chronica Boemorum*, MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 2, (I.15): 34-35.

²⁹ Seibt, "Heilige Herzog," p. 15 describes the monastic reform circle from which these Latin legends came as a group "that wanted to transform Christian Europe into a holy Utopia." I suspect that Seibt was over-influenced by the *vita* of Romuald of Ravenna, who is said to have wanted to make the whole world into a hermitage. The goals of the missionaries were modest, and can, I believe, best be explained as an expansion of the precept to "love your neighbor."

however, there is a much stronger suggestion that the monastic lifestyle enabled even a non-monk to perform truly godly work. So how much more could a professional monk accomplish, trained as he was by years of prayer in the monastic church?

The new interest in missionary work is especially obvious in the conversion of Bohemia, Poland, and Hungary, all in the years around 1000, and all regions in which the German emperor could exercise little direct influence. Interestingly, the area where monks were most clearly and decisively involved in mission, Hungary, was precisely the country that was the freest from western political pressures. The rulers of these lands had sound political reasons to invite churchmen from non-Germanic lands to aid in converting their people; what is surprising is that monks, not spurred by the demands of an imperial patron, went in considerable numbers to help establish the Christian Church in these territories. The case of Hungary shows the process of growing monastic enthusiasm for evangelization, and provides some of the earliest sources to suggest the radical stand of black monks toward their Rule, we can only guess in what numbers.

A small body of texts about individual monk-missionaries in the second half of the eleventh century reveals not only wide-ranging monastic activity, but also monastic efforts to defend themselves against criticism. Stephen of Hungary attracted people from all lands of western Europe to help with the work of conversion. The account from the first *vita* of the saintly king, perhaps written as early as 1077,³⁰ tells of a multitude of priests and clerics who responded to his call for evangelists. The hagiographer informs us that, "moved by the Holy Spirit, leaving their own places they chose to take on *peregrinatio* for the Lord." The author goes on to say that the phenomenon included "abbots and monks [who,] desiring to have nothing of their own, desired to live a regular life under the patronage of such a religious prince."³¹ This statement needs to be understood in the context of a mostly pagan country, in which a Christian prince's most urgent need was for the means of conversion. While this was not a high priority in the early conversion of Europe's Germanic

³⁰ Thomas von Bogyay, "Introduction," in *Ungarns Geschichtsschreiber*, ed. Bogyay (Graz, 1976), 1: 26.

³¹ "Inde multi presbiteri et clerici instinctu Spiritus paracliti compuncti, relictis sedibus propriis elegerunt pro Domino peregrinari; abbates et monachi nichil proprium habere cupientes, sub tam religiosissimi principis patrocinio regulariter vivere disideraverunt." *Vita maior Stephani regis Ungariae*, MGH SS 11, (7): 232.

peoples, it is clear at least in Stephen's case that standards of lay indoctrination into their new faith had changed.

Certainly monks and abbots at the very least demonstrated an impressive Christian presence in the land. More interesting is the terminology used of the "multitude of priests and clerics," many of whom could well have been monks. The author describes them as *peregrini*, a word associated for centuries with monastic wandering. We know of some monk-missionaries to the area, which suggests more widespread evangelization from the cloisters. Indeed, it is hard to imagine where the necessary personnel came from otherwise. Canons at this time were mostly limited to the clergy of collegiate churches and cathedrals, and would have been unlikely to abandon their comfortable lives. A few unconnected priests could be found at the imperial court and in episcopal entourages, but no stretch of the medieval love for inventing large numbers could make that supply source into a "multitude."

The description of monks as well as other clergy engaged in the work of conversion expressed in the first *vita* of Stephen is borne out by other evidence. The *Legenda Zoerardi et Benedicti* from c. 1064³² also reports the arrival of both canons and monks to Hungary as Stephen's fame spread.³³ Why did they come? The hagiographer provides a defense for possible critics. Like Abraham of old, they are in *peregrinatio* (wandering homeless asceticism) for the sake of God. This was easy for readers to believe, since they lived in a period when monastic writers especially admired the Irish with their long history of wandering, to the point that religious houses would "come upon" proof that an Irish monk or monks had founded them. In a newer vein, it is the Holy Spirit that draws these wanderers, one of the few statements among the accounts of these very mobile monks that alludes to Pentecost and its message of the duty to preach to people of all tongues (Acts 2.1–11).

This defense was necessary. Critics could accuse monks and others who joined the work of conversion in Hungary of avarice, even if they did not specifically decry the failure of monks to stay in their

³² For dating of Hungarian material I rely especially on Carlyle Macartney's *The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide* (Cambridge, 1953). See especially pp. 26–28.

³³ *Legenda ss. Zoerardi et Benedicti*, SS rer. Hung., 2, (1): 357. Written c. 1064/1074 by Bishop Maurus of Fünfkirchen. See the introduction to the edition for further information, especially pp. 352–53.

monasteries. Stephen presented many gifts to foreign monasteries, even dispatching an embassy (with unknown results) to far-away Abbot Odilo of Cluny.³⁴ Travelers were indeed welcomed with open-handed hospitality; their numbers included many monks, including Abbot Gauzlinus of Fleury and Richard of St. Vanne in Verdun, both leaders in monastic reform in their homelands and both pilgrims to Jerusalem who journeyed by the overland route through Hungary.³⁵ Richard of St. Vanne, a particularly important figure in this process, shows the inextricable links between the mentality of monks who wanted to work more actively for Christ at home and those with interests abroad, as we will see in Chapter III.

I believe that, while this "missionizing" phenomenon was present in the early centuries of monasticism,³⁶ such use of monks was extremely rare after the time of Charlemagne, who involved monks in the conversion of the Saxons in c. 800. Only one figure stands out in the period between 800 and c. 970: Ansgar of Corvey, who eventually became archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen. But the *vita* of Ansgar, written by his disciple Rimbert in c. 860, is very different from the cases already examined in its approach to Ansgar's mission, the reasons behind it, and the justification Rimbert already felt it necessary to give for it. The twelfth-century chronicler Adam of Bremen looked back on the ninth-century mission of Ansgar to refer to him as "outwardly an apostle but inwardly a monk,"³⁷ in language very similar to that used for Wolfgang of Regensburg. For Adam it is a

³⁴ *Vita maior Stephani*, (16): 238; Bálint Hóman, *König Stephan I. der Heilige* (Breslau, 1941), p. 140; Csóka, p. 56. This communication with Cluny apparently led to no lasting results, and the early Hungarian Church was tied to the Lotharingian-reform influenced southern German Church rather than to the Cluniac circle. Evidence summed up in Thomas von Bogyay, *Stephanus Rex. Versuch einer Biographie* (Vienna/Munich, 1975), p. 250; György Székely, "Ungarns Stellung zwischen Kaiser, Papst und Byzanz zur Zeit der Kluniazenserreform," in *Spiritualità cluniacense*. Convegno del centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 2 (Todi, 1960), p. 313. Székely, in "Gemeinsame Züge der ungarischen und polnischen Kirchengeschichte des XI. Jahrhunderts" *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis* 4 (1962): 63 points out that the earliest extant Hungarian liturgical books came from Lotharingia, which suggests even closer ties with the Lotharingian monastic reform.

³⁵ Ademar, *Historiarum libri III*, MGH SS 4, (III.65): 145; Hugo Flaviniacensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 8, (II.18-19): 393; Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de saint-Benoît*, 2nd ed. (Maredsous, 1948-1956), 1: 260-61.

³⁶ See for example, Friedrich Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich/Vienna, 1965).

³⁷ Adam of Bremen, *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*, ed. and trans. Francis J. Tschan (New York, 1959), (I.33): 34.

triumphant statement. It makes an interesting contrast to the description of Ansgar's mission by his disciple Rimbert.

Rimbert felt compelled to apologize very specifically for Ansgar's instability, displaying a bad conscience over his patron's unmonastic behavior. Early in his *vita* Rimbert launches into a long defense. Before telling of Ansgar's later deeds, he says: "first it should be investigated, on account of those who are perhaps less cognizant of this matter, for what reason he should have left the place where he had vowed stability, where among you [at Corbie] he was an oblate and promised obedience to God. . . ." This matter must be told, he goes on, "lest perhaps someone attribute to capriciousness what the man of God undertook for the salvation of souls, incited by divine compunction and love of *peregrinatio*."³⁸ Rimbert, like Adam and Wolfgang's hagiographers, considers Ansgar's activity justifiable, but the emphasis changed between the ninth century and the twelfth, when Adam wrote. The arguments are not significantly different, but the tone had altered radically. Significantly, Rimbert de-emphasized that Ansgar was a monk as soon as he had moved to his missionary work among the Scandinavians, while Adam of Bremen appears to revel in his hero's monastic state. The other major theme of Rimbert's *vita* is that of martyrdom. The Ansgar he depicts cares much less about converting the pagans than about winning the crown of martyrdom. Indeed, he tells how Ansgar had a vision in which he was led to God's presence. God examined him, and then, to Ansgar's disappointment, sent him back to life, saying: "Go, and you shall return to me crowned as a martyr."³⁹ Rimbert has difficulty in explaining the meaning of this vision, considering the fact that Ansgar died peacefully in his bed. There are two plausible explanations for this emphasis on martyrdom. Either Ansgar's vision was so well known that Rimbert could not leave it out of his account, or he is purposely trying to cast his hero into the frame of martyrdom, something familiar to and approved by the churchmen and monks of his age.

³⁸ "primo indagandum videtur propter eos qui huius rei forte minus conscii sunt, qua occasione a loco stabilitatis suae huc secesserit, et cum apud vos Deo oblatus sit ibique oboedientiam promiserit . . . ne forte aliquis levitati assignet, quod vir Dei divinae compunctionis instinctu et peregrinationis amore pro salute animarum suscepit." Rimburtus, *Vita Anskarii*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol., (6): 26; see also Arnold Angenendt, "Die irische Peregrinatio und ihre Auswirkungen auf dem Kontinent vor dem Jahre 800," in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Heinz Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982), 1: 72, for a discussion of this passage in terms of *peregrinatio*.

³⁹ "Vade, et martyrio coronatus ad me reverteris." Rimburtus, (3): 23.

The martyrdom topos in the *vita* is stronger than in any of our tenth- and eleventh-century accounts, suggesting that Rimbert needed a typical and understandable reason for a monk to abandon the cloister. Certainly in the ninth century, as Irish monks were increasingly barred from *peregrinatio* or settled in stable communities once they had reached a new land, *peregrinatio* would not have weighed heavily as a moral virtue. The age of missionaries was past, at least for a time. One can see it most clearly in Rimbert's *vita*: as he often repeats, Ansgar spent his entire career plagued by lack of support. The sources only mention a couple of helpers; the mission made little progress more for lack of workers than because of the dangers of the Scandinavian lands.⁴⁰ For all practical purposes, Ansgar, monk of Corvey, was alone.

Rimbert's *Vita Anskarii* is phrased in such terms that it did not encourage emulation, and, as I have said, it received very little. The statements in our three accounts of Wolfgang of Einsiedeln, later bishop of Regensburg, form a striking contrast to the situation Rimbert describes. Wolfgang's missionary journey to Hungary in 971/972 had little result, perhaps mainly because he did not know the language or customs of the area. In any case, he was soon called away to become bishop of Regensburg.⁴¹ Still, the documents available concerning the mission enable us to understand monastic attitudes toward mission at the time of their writing, sometime between 1037 and 1052. They reveal that a radical change occurred in the way at least some monks, both those who undertook mission and their brethren who were not personally involved, perceived evangelization. It is worth examining Wolfgang's case in further detail.

⁴⁰ For example, Sweden was left without a priest for seven years after the first missionaries there were driven out during a revolt. Ansgar finally sent the hermit Ardgarius to fill the post. Rimbert makes it plain that almost no qualified clergy wanted to join the ranks of missionaries and become prime targets for martyrdom. Charles Higounet, *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1986), p. 35 discusses Ansgar's lack of funding; Leclercq points out that the *vitae* of both Ansgar and his successor, Rimbert, show that very few monks were willing to take on missionary work. Jean Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale* (Paris, 1964), p. 62. Semmler argues that monks of Corbie, as well as its daughter houses Corvey, Turnhout, Meppen, and Visbeck did missionary work, but does not cite his sources. See Josef Semmler in "Corvey und Herford in der benedictinischen Reformbewegung des 9. Jahrhunderts" *FMS* 4 (1970): 307. I have only discovered Corvey and Corbie monks involved in the tiny northern mission.

⁴¹ See Georg Schwaiger, "Der heilige Bischof Wolfgang von Regensburg (972–994): Geschichte, Legende und Verehrung," in Schwaiger and Staber, eds., p. 44.

The various accounts of Wolfgang's life show some possible implications of the drive for religious perfection. Wolfgang began his religious life as a cleric. After a time, though, as Arnold of St. Emmeram's tells the tale, he wanted to be associated with "a stricter rule." The life of a cleric did not satisfy his need for religious expression. So Wolfgang gave up the material goods that probably went with his office and made his monastic profession at Einsiedeln (Einsiedler = hermit), a house that proclaimed in its very name that it was founded upon the site of a long-dead hermit and was noted for its own austerity and eremitical life.⁴² It is especially interesting that Einsiedeln was not a typical imperial monastery, closely connected to the politics and maneuvering of the imperial church system. Its abbots rarely appeared at the imperial court, and the house seems to have tried very hard to live up to its name. No evidence exists that it was a center from which missionaries were forced into action by imperial plans.⁴³

Instead, Einsiedeln had some eremitical characteristics, including an emphasis on private prayer. So it is not surprising that Wolfgang turned to contemplation once he had become a monk there. What is astonishing, though, is the report of the direction his meditations took. His mid-eleventh-century hagiographer reports that Wolfgang contemplated, "considering perpetually within himself how he might double the talent entrusted to him in the salvation of others." (Cf. the parable of the talents. Mt 25.14–30.) Whether or not Wolfgang put the matter to himself in that way, he did ask for and receive permission from his abbot to go to Hungary for the purpose of evangelizing the largely pagan Magyar population.⁴⁴ This does indeed seem, as Othloh of St. Emmeram describes it, to be a case of a vitally felt need to share God's blessings with others. For that to be possible, Othloh or Wolfgang or both believed that at least one monk had God's blessings. This could easily be expanded to: "all serious monks are specially blessed by God—and should share that blessing with others." Such a missionary urge simply does not appear in the monastic literature before Wolfgang's time. What is particularly sur-

⁴² Arnoldus s. Emmerammi, *Ex libris de s. Emmerammo duo*, MGH SS 4, (II.1): 556.

⁴³ The best modern account of Einsiedeln is that of Hagen Keller, *Kloster Einsiedeln im ottonischen Schwaben* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1964). See pp. 89 and 94 for this issue.

⁴⁴ "reputans iugiter secum, qualiter in salutem aliorum sibi concessum duplicaret talentum." Othloh, *Vita Wolfgangi*, MGH SS 4, (13): 530.

prising is that a monk should have sought out such a situation, as well as that it was expressed in such terms by c. 1050.

Most elements used to defend monastic missionaries appear in Arnold of St. Emmeram's brief account of Wolfgang's mission. He provides a monastic and biblical framework for his hero's activities that both puts Wolfgang firmly into the Christian tradition and breaks new ground in defense of the monastic life. Arnold tells how Wolfgang "because of these things deserting a particular monastery, and not monasticism itself, always longing to emulate the greater charisma of the apostles, left Germany and became an exile in Noricum."⁴⁵ This brief passage is packed with defenses of Wolfgang's mission. Arnold grasps the most central point first, the one that will provide a focus for criticism. Wolfgang *had* deserted his monastery. While this did happen occasionally, it was not laudable or saintlike behavior. Arnold's response to the implicit criticism is interesting. He argues carefully that although Wolfgang has left the monastery of Einsiedeln he has not in fact left the monastic life. In other words, Wolfgang lives and acts like a monk, although he is no longer a part of a community. The author assumes a clear distinction between body and spirit; although Wolfgang may be wandering far from his home, or from any cloister at all, his mind nevertheless remains firmly fixed in the ways of monasticism. This view of stability of the mind or soul, although frequent in the *Sayings* of the desert fathers, found little resonance in the ninth century and the first part of the tenth.

Also of great interest is that Wolfgang's intent was to "emulate the apostles." The ninth-century commentaries on the gospels do not present apostles as people whom others could imitate. They recounted the activities of the apostles much more as a matter of history than as material for emulation. If anyone could claim the right to be the successors of the apostles, it was the bishops. A quiet revolution has taken place here—people were looking at the apostles with new eyes as praiseworthy men who should be emulated in all ways, in other words with the sense that Jesus had not spoken just to the apostles, but to all men or women of religious conviction.

Comparing these early eleventh-century accounts to the mid-tenth century *vita* of John of Gorze provides another indication of how the

⁴⁵ "Cuius rei gratia monasterium et non monachum deserens, immo secundum apostolum maiora aemulari carismata cupiens, per Alamanniam devenit exul in Noricum." Arnoldus, (II.1): 556. Citing 1 Cor 12.31.

monastic landscape was shifting. This story, although it does not exactly parallel the cases of mission we have examined, gives insight into how a monk from the circle of tenth-century reformers would have regarded separation from the monastery. Most of the account is a panegyric of John's religious and specifically monastic excellence. Especially important is his abhorrence of contact with the laity, a world-view that must have made his position as cellarer particularly hard both for him and for the laymen with whom he had to deal. Disrupting this picture of a good traditional monk, however, John volunteered to deliver a letter to the caliph of Cordoba, when, as his hagiographer said, the abbot had been ordered to pick someone to go and everyone else was afraid. So the case is similar but far from identical to that of Wolfgang. John did not volunteer out of the blue, but only because someone had to do the job, in the tried and true method of an Ottonian ordering some member of the imperial clergy to find someone to do his dirty work.

Even more surprising is that mission plays no role in the *vita* of John of Gorze.⁴⁶ He went to deliver a message, and spent several years in Muslim Spain apparently without even attempting quiet small-scale evangelization. The reason given for his willingness to go in the first place was not to spread the light of Christianity to others, to increase the talents given him by God, but so that he himself might "be dissolved and be with Christ," i.e., that he might die as a martyr. (His wish was almost fulfilled since Otto I's letter unintentionally insulted the Muslim faith. The clergy of Spain, however, finally prevailed upon John to send his companion back for a new letter, rather than delivering the first one.)⁴⁷ The manuscript breaks off with John's appearance before the caliph, after refusing to change his ragged Benedictine habit for better clothing,⁴⁸ and presenting more a picture of Christian self-righteousness than of an evangelist. In other words, lack of physical stability could be justified for the sake of imperial orders or for martyrdom. However, it was by no means

⁴⁶ Of course it would be extremely dangerous to evangelize Muslims, since Muslim law included the death penalty against anyone attempting conversion of Muslims, but John could have worked among the Jews or have shown some interest in the life and habits of his fellow Christians. Instead, the hagiographer just passes over these years of waiting in Spain. On Muslim laws against proselytization see Kedar.

⁴⁷ *Iohannes s. Arnulfi*, (121–26): 372–74.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, (131): 375.

common and the hagiographer felt obliged to explain his hero's actions in terms that do not include care for others.

I have concentrated on the case of Wolfgang of Regensburg because the ideology of care for the world is so clearly expressed in the stories about him, although these accounts are somewhat late in comparison to the events they describe. I wish to argue that Othloh and his fellow writers were expressing a change in attitude that had come about before their time, and perhaps found its first full expression at about the time of Wolfgang's abortive mission in the 970's. This would mean that just as imperial aspirations were turning away from mission to the Slavs and Magyars, monks were finding reasons to enter the mission field on their own volition.

iv. *The problem of stability*

How could this redefinition of monasticism have taken place, one that could make Wolfgang a saint instead of a gyrovague? A crucial point is the shift in emphasis from *physical* stability and withdrawal from other humans to an *emotional* stability that could exist even in the midst of a crowd. This line of defense justified a great deal of monastic activity in the world. Of course it was not new. The fathers of monasticism had emphasized physical separation from the world more as a means to accomplish this mental distancing than as an end in itself. In an isolated ninth-century case, Rimbart tried to use this justification for Ansgar of Corvey.⁴⁹ In the late tenth century, however, the idea gained ground once again. Well before the full-scale defense of Wolfgang of Regensburg, a growing number of sources speak of monastic stability especially in terms of perseverance, rather than immobility.

One reason for the loosening definition is that stability was valued not just by monks but by the secular clergy. While the secular clerics (we know almost exclusively about bishops) drew much of their inspiration from the physical stability of monks, they also had other sources, besides other duties that made a narrow definition impossible. Thus one hagiographer praises the saintly priest Arduinus (d. 1009) for his imitation of Benedictine monasticism. An important part of this monastic behavior is that he was "stable." This does not

⁴⁹ Rimbartus, see especially (13): 34–35.

of course mean that he was restricted to a cloister, but that, in biblical imagery, his house was founded on firm stone and could not be thrown down by storms (Mt 7.25–27; Lk 6.48–9). As his hagiographer is careful to point out: “He was stable in all goodness and sanctity, and had extirpated all appetite for forbidden things from his soul.”⁵⁰ Bishop Adalbero II of Metz, in a *vita* written shortly after his death in 1005, is given credit for “stability in the faith” (*stabilitas in fide*).⁵¹ Burchard of Worms, a bishop who made a monastic profession only on his deathbed, was filled with all virtues from his youth, including the boast of his hagiographer that Burchard was “stable in justice” (*in iusto stabilis*).⁵² The same author describes that his personal motivation for writing this *vita* was that Burchard displayed “so much stability” (*quanta stabilitate*) in Christ’s works. Yet further, he tells how Burchard loved a young man for his “stability of soul.”⁵³

In all of these examples, the person described is not himself a monk, so the authors may have applied a looser definition of stability than would have been the case for monks. The passage of ideas was not just from monks to the secular clergy, however. John of Fécamp, a leading Benedictine writer of the mid-eleventh century, also spiritualizes the exhortation to stability found in the Benedictine Rule, perhaps inspired at least in part by definitions used regarding bishops. In his lamentation on his inability to lead a good life, John prays for a place of solitude, so he can renew himself after his work as abbot. As he complains, before becoming abbot he had attained blessed solitude but lost it because of his instability.⁵⁴ His instability is mental, not physical. As he says shortly after this passage, his distraction is the noise of the world that reaches into the monastery, turning his mind away from God, not any physical state. We should

⁵⁰ “Eratque stabilis in omni bonitate, et sanctitate, omnesque illicitos appetitus radicitus ab animo extirparat.” *Vita s. Arduini confessoris*, AASS Aug. III, (10): 218. The date of composition of this work is unknown, but it appears from the context that it was written early in the anti-simony controversy, in other words, shortly after the turn of the millennium.

⁵¹ Constantinus abbas, *Vita Adalberonis II. Mettensis episcopi*, MGH SS 4, (22): 666.

⁵² *Vita Burchardi episcopi Wormatiensis*, MGH SS 4, (1): 832–33. The exact date of this composition is not known, but a cleric of Worms who had known Burchardus was the author, so it was probably written not too long after Burchardus’ death in 1025.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, (prologus): 831. “Et quia stabilitatem animi in eo intellexit, prae ceteris multum illum delexit.” (7): 835.

⁵⁴ John of Fécamp, “Lamentatio,” in Jean Leclercq and Jean-Paul Bonnes, *Un maître de la vie spirituelle au XI^e siècle: Jean de Fécamp* (Paris, 1946), pp. 184–97.

note that John was a conservative, fighting as did his contemporary, Peter Damian, against physical contact with the world. Such a view expressed by a conservative strongly supports the notion that there had been a change in emphasis on the issue of stability.

Two scenes, both in the second *vita* of Godehard of Hildesheim,⁵⁵ return our examination to the case of Wolfgang. Godehard was a monk of Niederaltaich and active in imperial monastic reform before his elevation to the episcopate. About Godehard himself the hagiographer says that as bishop he remained stable in the cult and fear of God, whether in private or in public.⁵⁶ This text reveals the influence both of the New Testament and particularly of the writings of Gregory the Great. It closely follows Matthew 6.5–6, in which Jesus recommends that shutting oneself up in a private place to pray is better than showing a pharisaical ostentation. It also, like many works of the tenth century, reflects the widespread popularity of the works of Gregory the Great, especially of his *Pastoral Care*, a handbook for bishops on how to meet the needs of the active and the contemplative lives.⁵⁷ The emphasis that stability is essentially a private virtue, having little to do with staying within a cloister, fits well with Gregory's desire for the monastic life, coupled with his burdens as bishop of Rome.

The central concern of the *Pastoral Care* is to confront a problem. It is a work on the government of souls, as Gregory introduces it.⁵⁸ Thus it accepts as a basic premise that it is necessary for at least some segment of the Christian population to take action against evil, rather than to wait passively for God's intervention.⁵⁹ Yet Gregory and other pastoral caregivers had to confront the premise that

⁵⁵ Wolfherius, a Saxon cleric who held office in Hildesheim under Bernward, gives a mixed view of monastic/clerical life since he himself studied at Hersfeld and Niederaltaich. He wrote a first *vita* of the bishop in 1039 for the use of the abbess of Gandersheim, only a year after Godehard's death. Later, in c. 1054 he composed a second, slightly shorter *vita* for the abbot of St. Michael's in Hildesheim. The latter work is much more concerned with Godehard's posthumous miracles, which perhaps explains why Wolfherius felt the need to write twice. See Wolfherius, *Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildenesheimensis prior*, MGH SS 11, (introduction): 162–63.

⁵⁶ Wolfherius, *Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildenesheimensis posterior*, MGH SS 11, (20): 207.

⁵⁷ The *Pastoral Care* reached the height of its effectiveness in the Carolingian renaissance, when it was used as a model for bishops and secular clergy. Heinz Hürten, "Gregor der Große und der mittelalterliche Episkopat" *ZfKG* 73 (1962): 18.

⁵⁸ Gregory, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Henry Davis (New York, 1950), (I.1): 23. (SC 381, pp. 128–30.)

⁵⁹ See Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988), p. 50 for this idea as a shift in theology.

governing others distracts one's own mind from spiritual matters.⁶⁰ Therefore, the main focus of the work is how a person in a position of authority can avoid corruption, even when forced to daily teaching and other communication with less godly people. Gregory warns throughout that the preacher should not neglect himself, so that he falls even while he is lifting others up.⁶¹ In this as in his other works, Gregory is firm that the soul can remain strong even in the face of temptation.⁶² Still, it is a difficult enough matter that he gives practical advice on thought and conduct, to make both the active and contemplative lives possible. Indeed, for Gregory, goodness can be achieved through an equilibrium between these two forms of life, and he made it clear that he believed it neither possible nor desirable to be a pure contemplative.⁶³

One of the most interesting elements of the *Pastoral Care*, especially considering that it was written by a monk and that in our period it appears that monks read and used it, is Gregory's insistence that a call to the active life cannot be neglected. Fitting people cannot refuse authority. It is a rejection of the gifts that God has given them. Those who withdraw into quietude (*quies*) when they are suited to serve their neighbors are guilty—of arrogance, of disobedience to God, of excessive self-love at the expense of others.⁶⁴ To be persistent in refusing to share is to hide one's talents, as in the parable of Matthew 25.18.⁶⁵ We have already encountered that comparison; it probably came from reading the *Pastoral Care*. Viewed in this light, pastoral care was indeed a witness of love.⁶⁶ As Straw points out, Gregory's ideal saint was someone like Paul, who descended from the third heaven to help his weaker brethren.⁶⁷ Gregory did acknowledge that not everyone is able to reconcile the active and contemplative lives.⁶⁸ With firm self control and self-awareness, though, one can reach a balance between action and contemplation, and save not just others

⁶⁰ Gregory, (I.4): 27–28. (SC 381, p. 140.)

⁶¹ Ibid., (IV.1): 234. (SC 382, p. 538.)

⁶² For the wider application of this idea in Gregory's work, see Straw, pp. 201, 235, 237.

⁶³ See Ibid., p. 20.

⁶⁴ Gregory, (I.5): 29–31. (SC 381, pp. 144–48.)

⁶⁵ Ibid., (I.9): 38. (SC 381, p. 160.)

⁶⁶ As Hürten calls it, p. 27.

⁶⁷ Straw, pp. 103–4, citing *Dialogue* 3.17.9 (SC 260, p. 342).

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 192.

but oneself. Humility is the key, as Richards describes it, "the root of goodness" in Gregory's thought.⁶⁹

The use of Gregory's *Pastoral Care* to describe the possibility and even desirability of a mixed life of action and contemplation is very natural in the *vita* of a bishop, who remains a monk but is forced by his office into worldly matters. Indeed, Gregory paints a very attractive picture of contemplation as a stepping stone to action, after which it is again necessary to restore one's energies with another contemplative phase. As he is careful to point out, action without contemplation is ultimately sterile, as the practitioner will simply burn himself out. Gregory points out how Moses in the Tabernacle was caught up in contemplation, but went out again to care for the weak. Similarly, Jesus prayed alone on the mountain, but returned to towns, where he worked miracles for many.⁷⁰ Truly, it is hard to imagine a change in monastic views toward the world without reliance on Pope Gregory's theological explication.

v. *Monks and Christian responsibility*

It is stranger to find this Gregorian thought coupled with a holy person who never entered the episcopate, and thus presumably never had duties toward the world. But the core of Gregory's thought—the need for care of souls to prepare for the second coming⁷¹—is not limited to bishops, or to Gregory's own time. The *Pastoral Care* orders one to seek the greater good rather than personal quietude (*quies*). Such a term could not help but bring monks to mind, especially in the context of Gregory's own works, which were popular monastic reading. Gregory uses the word *quies* more than any other to describe monasticism.⁷² But when Gregory writes of monks leading an active life, it is always in the context of being called to the service of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁷³ Our monks' innovation is in following

⁶⁹ Jeffrey Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London, 1980), p. 48. Straw makes it a central locus of her analysis of Gregory, see especially p. 189.

⁷⁰ Gregory, (II.5): 57–58. (SC 381, pp. 198–200.)

⁷¹ Richards, p. 54.

⁷² Remigius Rudmann, *Mönchtum und kirchlicher Dienst in den Schriften Gregors des Großen* (St. Ottilien, 1956), p. 35.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, passim. This is also the general sense of the *Pastoral Care*.

Gregory's teachings on their own initiative, not as bishops or in the service of bishops.

An interesting substory in the later *vita* of Godehard of Hildesheim is the tale of Gunther the Hermit, a figure who fascinated many in the early eleventh century. Gunther was a nobleman who in 1005 converted to the monastic life at Niederaltaich. He was already middle aged when he did so. After his conversion, at first he was much tempted to leave again, but was divinely warned that he must serve God with obedience and stability or he would fail, returning to the vanities of the world. The author goes on to say that just as a man cannot serve two lords, "a monk ought not return to the world like a dog to its vomit."⁷⁴ But stability here means persistence in a monastic attitude, not solitude from engagement in the world. Careful examination shows that Gunther led a very active life as a preacher and missionary, building bridges and roads, and even negotiating treaties between secular rulers.⁷⁵ After three years as a monk he received permission to become a hermit in Bohemia, where he lived until his death at an extremely advanced age in 1045. He founded a community at Rinchnach in Bohemia, and appears to have attracted many followers and widespread attention.⁷⁶ It was especially necessary for such a man to make the point that he really was a monk, despite appearances to the contrary, or have others make the point for him. Otherwise, his unconventional life was certain to provoke criticism. Thus comes the emphasis on stability despite the appearance of movement. Those stories that describe such monks as Gunther and Wolfgang share many characteristics of apologetic lit-

⁷⁴ "nec monachum ad seculum ut canem ad vomitum reverti debere." Wolfherius, *Vita Godehardi post.*, (8): 202.

⁷⁵ Gotthard Lang, "Gunther, der Eremit, in Geschichte, Sage und Kult" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 59 (1941): 30, 35. Hermann Grauert, "Rom und—Gunther der Eremit?" *Hjfb* 19 (1898): 249–87. Many of the arguments of this work have been disproved in the last century. The point I find interesting is that Grauert speaks of Gunther as a preacher of penitence, a second John the Baptist, citing Othloh s. Emmerammi *Liber Visionum*, MGH SS 11, (14): 384. This moves Gunther into the ranks of the ecclesiastical reformers, who wanted to deepen the religious life of people in Christian lands.

⁷⁶ The *Vita Guntheri eremitae*, MGH SS 11: 276–79 is a late work, which is of little use here. The best sources on Gunther are Wolfherius, *Vita Godehardi post.*, (8): 201–202; and a long description in Arnoldus, (II.61–63): 571–72. For a good general account and analysis, see Herbert Grundmann, "Eremiti in Germania dal X al XII secolo: 'Einsiedler' e 'Klausner,'" in *L'Eremitismo in occidente nei Secoli XI e XII*, Settimana Mendola 2 (1965). See especially p. 320.

erature. This includes an air of ambivalence, of trying to make sense out of unheard-of behavior.

Like many active monks in his own and following generations, Gunther combined elements of both eremitical and Benedictine life. He was a professed member of the Niederaltaich community and maintained close ties with his brethren there after departing for his hermitage.⁷⁷ In addition, the community at Rinchnach, despite its eremitical form of life, followed the Benedictine Rule, but with noteworthy modifications.⁷⁸ As with other groups and individuals who established similar mixed lives, Gunther's form of asceticism included a large element of outreach beyond the confines of the cloister. As we shall see, the eremitical life made it possible for one to come into closer contact with the laity than did the traditional cenobitic life, and often this must have been a factor behind Gunther's choice.

The sources that describe Gunther's life and work display the extreme tension between desire for solitude and perceived sense of responsibility for others that is typical of many monastic figures of the eleventh century. In his long account of Gunther, Arnold of St. Emmeram reports that his subject first withdrew from Niederaltaich to the Bohemian Rinchnach for greater privacy. This may be a reflection of Arnold of St. Emmeram's notion of spiritual ascent, which he also applies in his account of Wolfgang of Regensburg. It may equally well reflect a real craving for solitude on the part of his heroes.

Gunther, true to this new hagiographical form, fled from his followers and established a new hermitage farther off in the forest.⁷⁹ Here Gunther appears as a typical world-fearing religious of the tenth century. The two pictures, of the curmudgeonly hermit and of the holy man active in the world, are simply confusing upon first reading. There is no reason to doubt that Gunther led an active life, although this was beginning to appear so commonly as to be almost standard in the *vitae* of hermits. Gunther certainly did create not one, but two, communities, and there must have been considerable

⁷⁷ Arnoldus, (II.62): 572 tells how Gunther was supplied with food from the home monastery. Once in a great snow storm the food delivery could not get to him. Gunther fasted for three days, but then did not want to tempt God, so began digging in the snow for herbs to eat. Then the man with the bread arrived. In a document of Henry III from 17 January 1040, Gunther's gift of his foundation of Rinchnach to Niederaltaich is confirmed.

⁷⁸ DKII #135, p. 182, 1. January 1029. See also Lang.

⁷⁹ Arnoldus, (II.61): 572.

interest in the spectacle of an elderly nobleman-turned-monk, as one can see in the pages of contemporary annals.⁸⁰ There is also a palpable tension between rejecting and embracing the world simultaneously. Such a tension suggests a suspicion that involvement in the world was not really such a good thing after all, and that true holiness demands separation. The weight of evidence suggests that at least at times Gunther did try to flee from the world, especially from the people among whom he was all too famous. "Gunther became a monk, renouncing the world and its pomps,"⁸¹ as one annalist described his conversion to the monastic life, in language very reminiscent of the vows taken at baptism. In the baptismal service the person being baptized or his sponsor renounces Satan; here the author replaces "Satan" with "the world." Gunther's *vita* reads with a sense of inevitability. Gunther was so much holier—because of his withdrawal—that people soon began visiting him in his hermitage, a common enough plague faced by those with a reputation for holiness. Then he fled again, we are told, "fearing lest the visits of the people and the little glories of the world should, *under the form of religion*, steal or diminish anything of truth or good."⁸² The sentence just quoted expresses three themes: that hiding holiness is difficult; that enemies could blame innovators for failure to act in accordance with non-monastic goals, using their outward appearance to cover up their corruption; and that there really were frightening and exhilarating temptations. Arnold's statement expressed a view that straddled both new and old in monastic life.

It is interesting that not one but two apparently unrelated accounts should have struck the warning note of the pomps and "little glories"

⁸⁰ Lampertus Hersfeldensis [a. 1006, 1008], p. 50 reports both Gunther's conversion to the monastic life and when he became a hermit, as does *Annales Hildesheimenses*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol. [a. 1006, 1008], (III): 29–30; Thietmar Merseburgensis episcopus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 9, (VII.52): 462 tells that Gunther went to preach to the Liutizi in 1017; *Annalista Saxo*, MGH SS 6 [a. 1040], p. 684 tells how he negotiated a peace treaty, while Herimannus of Reichenau supplements this account with a report of the aid Gunther gave to the German army in Bohemia and Gunther's later death, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1040], p. 123; [a. 1045], p. 125; his death is also recorded in *Annales Augustani*, MGH SS 3 [a. 1045], p. 126.

⁸¹ "Guntherus divina pietate instinctus renuntians seculo et pompis eius . . ." *Annales Hildesheimenses* [a. 1006], p. 29.

⁸² "Tunc ille timens, ne frequentia populi et gloriola seculi sibi sub specie religionis quid de veris surriperet aut minueret bonis . . ." Arnoldus, (II.61): 572. Emphasis mine.

of the world. Arnold accepts that monastic vocation by itself was not enough for safety in a dangerous world of temptation. Could a person maintain his vocation while acting in the world? Or would this contact make his life a fraud, so that, although the hermit claimed religious motivation, his own religiosity would suffer irreparable harm? Arnold, despite his advocacy of Wolfgang, seems dubious here. His doubt underplays Gunther's activities, and perhaps explains why Arnold is so careful to emphasize that Gunther did his best to escape from such snares in the form of service to the world.

Yet the same man who fled to the depths of the Bavarian Forest for obscurity and solitude was famous for his missionary work to the Slavs and Hungarians. Thietmar reports that Gunther set out from Magdeburg in 1017, apparently with Henry II's approval, to preach to the Liutizi, a still-pagan Slavic tribe.⁸³ He was responsible for building the monastery of Bakonybél in Hungary and establishing monks from Niederaltaich there, although no accounts specifically report his own activity in that area. Still, Stephen of Hungary gave the saintly hermit many gifts and urged him to visit frequently.⁸⁴ Gunther was a noted preacher, although he never became a priest and learned very little Latin, so he could not claim a preaching duty on the basis of ordination.⁸⁵ A particularly revealing account tells of a priest whom God punished for mocking Gunther as an uneducated layman. The story provides strong evidence of the irregular nature of Gunther's life, and is also an interesting example of how the reformers ignored custom for the sake of relations with the laity.⁸⁶

Gunther had close ties to the Bohemian monastery of Břevnov that probably included participation in mission.⁸⁷ After Gunther's death, his disciples continued mission work in Slavic lands, showing

⁸³ Thietmar, (VII.52): 462. For analysis of this venture, see Claude, pp. 236–37. It is less surprising that a man of Gunther's rank and influence should have been encouraged or forced to take a hand in politics at times. His most important intervention in that sphere was negotiating a peace treaty between Bretislaus of Bohemia and Henry III in 1040. *Annalista Saxo* [a. 1040], p. 684; see Lang, pp. 45–49.

⁸⁴ Georg Stadtmüller and Bonifaz Pfister, *Geschichte der Abtei Niederaltaich 741–1971* (Munich, 1971), p. 115; Lang, pp. 41–42; Csóka, p. 42; *Vita maior Stephani*, (14): 236, for Gunther's activities in Hungary.

⁸⁵ Wolferius, *Vita Godehardi post.*, (9): 202.

⁸⁶ Arnoldus, (II.64): 572. Lang, p. 39 has suggested that Gunther actually left the missionary work to clerics recruited from Niederaltaich, but this suggestion of his non-participation is not borne out by the available evidence.

⁸⁷ Karl Bosl, "Herzog, König und Bischof im 10. Jahrhundert," in *Bohemia Sacra*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Düsseldorf, 1974), p. 288.

that the notion of contact in the world was not, as it seems to have been in Wolfgang's case, the dream of a single charismatic individual, but rather of a group that associated with the vision of their role in the world presented by a founding father, for which we have several examples. Gunther's monastery of Rinchnach appears to have continued its founder's interest in the mission to the Liutizi. In c. 1050 two monks from that house were martyred at Rethra, which appears to have been a Christian outpost.⁸⁸ Abbot Ansvr of Ratzeburg and several fellow monks were killed in the Slavic pagan reaction of 1066. Tradition has it that Ansvr was an active preacher in the area.⁸⁹ Apparently the monks at that time played some visible role in Slavic lands, even if they represented not only a foreign God but German efforts to control the territory in which they lived.

Gunther, according to Wolfherius, had a vision that sums up his extraordinary activity in the world. It also expresses a very clear justification of monastic interference in the world, the more astonishing because in it the issue of monasticism is ignored. In this vision, Gunther saw an olive tree growing. He understood it to mean the spreading of God's Word to countless people, even as the olive branches spread over an ever greater area.⁹⁰ Wolfherius never emphasizes that it is a monk who is attempting to evangelize. Instead, Wolfherius has created or reported Gunther's sense of direct divine command and commendation for his work.

Another *vita* that helps to show the extent of this outreach phenomenon is that of Bononius, who died as abbot of Lucedio near Vercelli in 1026. He also combined a longing for the eremitical life

⁸⁸ Adam of Bremen, (III.20): 131. Claude, p. 237 points out that Rinchnach was the only monastery in the Bohemian Woods at that time, so Adam must be referring to monks of that house. Wolfgang Bröske, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Lutizenbundes* (Münster/Cologne, 1955), p. 77 dates the martyrdom to 1045. The Liutizi were the objective of several of the missionary ventures of the time. They were a Slavic tribe that lived along the Elbe, and became a direct neighbor of Bohemia shortly before 1000 when Boleslav Chrobry placed the territory of Pomerania up to the Oder River under his rule. Bröske suggests that Adalbert of Prague had planned the evangelization of the Liutizi, one step of which was Adalbert's foundation of the monastery of Meseritz. The Five Brothers also appear to have directed their mission toward this tribe. See Bröske, pp. 53–55.

⁸⁹ Adam of Bremen, (III.50): 157; for a general account of Ansvr and his companions, see AASS Jul. IV: 97–108; Helmold of Bosau, *The Chronicle of the Slavs*, trans. Francis J. Tschan (New York, 1935), p. 97. See also Ulrich Faust, ed., *Die Benediktinerklöster in Niedersachsen, Schleswig-Holstein und Bremen* (St. Ottilien, 1979), p. 431.

⁹⁰ Wolfherius, *Vita Godehardi post.*, (11): 203.

with the desire both to convert pagans and to provide pastoral care to Christians. As with Gunther, this union of hermitage and evangelism suggests that Bononius could not find what he sought within the strictures of monastic life of his time. After a few years as a monk, he went to Egypt and became a hermit near Cairo. The account of his life there, written by a monk of Lucedio soon after the abbot's death, tells of his great activity in spreading the Christian faith and aiding Christians in Egypt. He gave advice to many, restored ruined churches, and went from place to place preaching, both to increase the faith of Christians and to convert Muslims. Eventually he returned to Italy, where he became abbot of Lucedio.⁹¹ Thus Bononius, in the popular eye if not in reality, carried his eremitical ideals to a variety of people in various situations. The account includes special praise for the great care he showed of others. His hagiographer treated it as natural that a monk and hermit should show his faith in such a way. But why? Is it simply a change of monastic vocabulary, or had a real change or changes taken place within that loose framework known as Benedictinism?

At least part of the answer to our question is found in Arnold's account of tenth-century St. Emmeram. While he is at pains to tell the reader about Wolfgang's missionary activity, he says nothing about monks preaching their religion before Wolfgang. This uncloistered, traveling monk emerges without precedent. However, before the century's end, others were moving onto the ground staked out by Wolfgang.

vi. *A Romualdian missionary movement*

The situation shifted with the emergence of Romuald of Ravenna and his disciples. With them, in the years slightly before and after 1000, it is possible to trace a gradual emergence of educated and articulate missionaries, such as Europeans had not seen since the end of the Anglo-Saxon mission to Germany in the eighth century. Romuald's group of evangelists is especially interesting for this study since they were all unconventional monks—men who did not fit into

⁹¹ *Vita et miracula sancti Bononii abbatis Locediensis*, MGH SS 30,2, (4–6): 1027. Hofmeister connects Bononius with Camaldoli. See Philipp Hofmeister, "Mönchtum und Seelsorge bis zum 13. Jahrhundert" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 65 (1953–1954): 262.

the standard patterns that had made up Benedictine life for generations. Adalbert of Prague, Bruno of Querfurt, "the five hermit brethren," along with Romuald himself and his followers were all active in the mission field. Besides the extensive evidence for these missionaries, several other monastic sources suggest missionary concerns. Together, the evidence for the activities of these men is impressive for an age with so few records. It suggests the evolution of a new view of what a full monastic life entailed, including a new popularity for ideas of mission and teaching directed toward Christian society. Can it be a coincidence that all of the missionaries listed above were associated in some way with the Camaldolesi, the first of the Italian hermitage-monasteries? This reform group was just getting underway at the time of their missions, and it stretches the imagination to believe that there is no connection between their missionary interests and the fact that the Camaldolesi were among the earliest reformers visibly to shake off strict adherence to the Benedictine Rule. Not only were most of these missionaries Camaldolese hermits, but Adalbert of Prague's hagiographer was also a follower of Romuald of Ravenna, Camaldoli's founder. As we will see, evidence of this concern for evangelization and teaching appears most often in these new organizations or among isolated adventurers, not only in the border territories of the Empire, but also in the heartland of Germany and spreading into Italy, so it becomes harder and harder to tell ecclesiastical reformers from missionaries. Rather than engaging in an active life only on the borders, monks were moving in increasing numbers into the mainstream of life in the German Empire.

The first and best *vita* of Adalbert of Prague tells an odd story that really fits into no category. Adalbert's life was eventful. He was the son of a Bohemian princely family, was educated at the cathedral school in Magdeburg, and became bishop of Prague in 983. Life as a bishop was difficult, though, and Adalbert found it impossible to impose his religious views on the semi-pagan populace of his diocese. He soon gave up in frustration, went to Rome, and became a monk in the community of Sts. Bonifacius and Alexius.⁹² He was recalled to his see after three years in the monastery and agreed to

⁹² There has been a rather heated debate among scholars over whether the Roman monastery of Sts. Bonifacius and Alexius was a "training ground" for missionaries. For the most balanced view, see Karl Bosl, "Das Kloster San Alessio auf dem Aventin zu Rom" *Beiträge zu Südosteuropa-Forschung* 2 (1970), especially p. 313, note 1. Bosl argues strongly that Sts. Bonifacius and Alexius had a considerable influence on

return on the condition that a monastery—Břevnov, on the outskirts of Prague—be erected for him and staffed with monks from Rome, where he could spend time in contemplation and find monastic companionship. Thus he was leading an oddly double life, sworn to obey the Benedictine Rule *after* he had been consecrated as bishop, an elevation that was understood to overrule the vow of stability to place. In the event, Adalbert found physical stability impossible, either as bishop or as monk. After being forced to leave the abbey in which he made his profession, Adalbert found it impossible to reestablish himself in his diocese. The situation became impossible when the reigning duke of Bohemia, Boleslas II, had most of Adalbert's family massacred. Adalbert returned to his monastery in Rome, but after about a year and a half his archbishop forced him to return to his flock yet again. Recognizing the impossibility of living in his diocese, Adalbert gained permission to go as a missionary to Prussian territory if his flock remained so unruly. It was in the mission field that he was martyred on 23 April 997.⁹³

To his contemporaries and hagiographers, Adalbert was a monk. There was no effort, as in Rimbert's *vita* of Ansgar, to underplay the monastic elements in his life. The authors of the two *vitae* of Adalbert, one from c. 1000, the other certainly from before 1009, show him thinking, planning, and acting in a monastic way, and stress his monastic spirituality. He had met the monastic reform leaders Maiolus of Cluny and Bishop Gerard of Toul at Pavia in 983, when he went to gain imperial confirmation for his election, and the meeting may

mission, and speaks of it as a sort of missionary school. Bosl's interpretation is a compromise, and I believe it best fits the available evidence.

⁹³ There are several good sources for the life of St. Adalbert of Prague. The anonymous *vita* frequently attributed to John Canaparius was written within a few years of his death, as were two versions of a *vita* by his relative Bruno Querfurtensi that number among the greatest works of medieval hagiography. The praise poem "Quatuor immensi" has been dated to the end of the tenth century by Mathilde Uhlirz, *Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Adalbert* (Göttingen, 1957), but Gieysztor is convincing in his arguments that the work was actually composed three centuries later. See Alexander Gieysztor, "Sanctus et gloriosissimus martyr Christi Adalbertus," in *La conversione al Cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo*, Settimana Spoleto 14 (1967): 615. Adalbert's martyrdom also received at least a brief mention in most of the chronicles and annals of the time, important evidence for his wide fame. See Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum*, (I.10): 22; Thietmar, (IV.28): 165; *Vita maior Stephani*, (4–5): 231–32; Cosmas, (I.31): 56. There are brief mentions in *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, p. 73; *Annales Lamberti*, MGH SS 3: 91; *Annales Pragenses*, MGH SS 3: 119; *Annales Posonienses*, SS rer. Hung. 1: 125; *Annales Ottenburani*, p. 5, all under the year 997.

have influenced him in favor of the monastic life.⁹⁴ He even undertook his mission to the Prussians as a monk. Before setting out on what proved to be his final journey, Adalbert visited the shrines of the great saints of Western Europe. Only one was a martyr; all were venerated in prestigious Benedictine monasteries, a situation that again stresses Adalbert's monastic profession.⁹⁵ Adalbert used Poland as his base for the evangelization in Prussia, which he did by founding the monastery of Trzemeszno there.⁹⁶ When he met his death, he was accompanied only by a monk and a priest who probably acted as translator.⁹⁷ Adalbert is "that holy monk" (*sanctus ille monachus*).⁹⁸ In the earliest *vita* the author has Adalbert describe himself to a pagan lord as follows: "I am by birth a Slav, Adalbert by name, a monk by profession, formerly a bishop by order, now by office your apostle."⁹⁹

To the best of my knowledge, this is the first reference to a missionary as an apostle since the *vita* of Ansgar. It is worth taking a moment to consider the implications of this term, especially as used toward a monk-missionary. It was common knowledge that the cloistered monastic life was itself the *vita apostolica*, a re-creation of the communal life of the apostles described in the second chapter of Acts. Tenth-century authors, when describing a character in terms of apostolicity, normally emphasized traditional monastic virtues: love of neighbor (in this case, the other brethren of the monastery), seclusion from the polluted outside world, and so forth. It appears to have been nearly forgotten that the original sense of "apostle" is "one sent out" and that before his Ascension Christ commissioned the first apostles to "go forth into the world, converting all peoples and

⁹⁴ Prinz, *Böhmen*, p. 81; Dvornik, *Making*, p. 101 both stress the importance of this meeting for the creation of Adalbert's reform perspective. Karl Bosl, "Adalbert von Prag—Heiliger an einer europäischen Zeitwende," in his *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn* (Munich/Vienna, 1976), p. 118 suggests that Adalbert was much more influenced by Cluny than Gorze, but this seems unlikely in terms of simple geography, since there would have been much more opportunity for contact with monks of Gorzian orientation. See Thomas v. Bogyay, "Adalbert von Prag und die Ungarn—ein Problem der Quellen-Interpretation" *Ungarn-Jb* 7 (1976): 26, who suggests that Adalbert imbibed the spirit of Gorzian reform in his time as a student in Magdeburg.

⁹⁵ Pointed out in Gieysztor "Sanctus," p. 624.

⁹⁶ Tadeusz Manteuffel, *The Formation of the Polish State* (Detroit, 1982), p. 60.

⁹⁷ See Uhlirz, p. 78.

⁹⁸ *S. Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris vita prior*, MPH series nova 4,1, (28): 45.

⁹⁹ "Sum natiuitate Slauus, nomine Adalbertus, professione monachus, ordine quondam episcopus, officio nunc uester apostolus." *Ibid.*, (30): 42. The later Cosmas Pragensis probably used this passage when he described the chronologically earlier arrival of Diethmar of Saxony in Prague as: "*presbiter promotione, monachus professione*," "a priest by promotion, a monk by profession." Cosmas, (I.23): 44.

baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28.19). Sometimes authors applied the term apostle to bishops, as successors of the apostles, but not to monks in the sense of someone who actually goes out and does something. That is why this reference to Adalbert stands out. Such missionaries were certainly reacting to situations as they found them. The anonymous author was not following a tradition when he named Adalbert an apostle, or if he was, no trace remains for us. It seems much more likely that he was emphasizing different parts of well-known biblical texts, or applying them more widely.¹⁰⁰

The author of this first *vita* of Adalbert stands out as the first clear and unequivocal proponent of a new ideal that was just emerging in western and central Europe. First, Adalbert's life is for the author a testament to the renewed power of the ideal of *peregrinatio*, and second, martyrdom fascinated him, in the broad sense of witnessing to Christian truth, a theme that came to be explored in hagiography throughout the eleventh century. *Peregrinatio* is a major thread in Adalbert's life. It is dangerous, especially when combined with evangelization. When he first left his see in 989 Adalbert went to Rome, planning to go on to Jerusalem, where he hoped to live a life of poverty and obscurity rather than entering the stability of a monastery. The monks of Monte Cassino convinced the discouraged bishop to enter a monastery rather than waste his life in what the author has them describe as useless wanderings; nevertheless, the wandering impulse still marked him out as a strong proponent of the ancient monastic practice, marginalized in Carolingian society, of *peregrinatio*.¹⁰¹ When his failure as bishop of Prague was obvious, it appears to have been at Adalbert's own request that the pope commissioned him to evangelize the Prussians. He was not willing to settle down yet again in his monastery.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ See my article on the shift in the ninth and tenth centuries from a narrow definition of Christ's precepts as binding only on the apostles, to a sense that all good Christians should follow them. Jestice, "Gorzian Reform," *passim*.

¹⁰¹ Bruno Querfurtensi, *S. Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris vita altera*, MPH series nova 4,2, (13): 15. The monks of Monte Cassino wanted a resident bishop in their own monastery, and Adalbert appears to have left in some disgust when he discovered their ulterior motives. See Heinrich G. Voigt, *Adalbert von Prag* (Westend/Berlin, 1898), p. 65. Jerzy Kloczowski, "L'érémisme dans les territoires slaves occidentaux," in *L'érémisme in occidente*, p. 336 points to Adalbert's frequent travels as evidence of eremitical traits.

¹⁰² *Vita prior Adalberti*, (22): 34; Bruno, *Vita Adalberti*, (18): 23. Büttner, "Erzbischof

An astonishingly vigorous debate has ranged over the question of whether Adalbert truly sought martyrdom, which of course has further implications in our investigation of whether monastic goals were undergoing an internal change. Wenskus argues strongly that this martyrdom-wish is the invention of Adalbert's second hagiographer, Bruno of Querfurt, who followed him to martyrdom at the hands of the Prussians in 1009, as we will see in detail below.¹⁰³ Did Adalbert, as Bruno of Querfurt claimed, long to be a martyr? Bruno himself, in a literary tour de force, shows Adalbert hesitating at the end, and in his *vita* Bruno as author cries out to his hero Adalbert not to weaken.¹⁰⁴ According to Bruno, Adalbert had longed for martyrdom for a long time, his heart burned for it, he sought "happy and incomparable martyrdom."¹⁰⁵ This has been described as Bruno's own particular obsession, also expressed in his *Vita quinque fratrum*, rather than as a reflection of Adalbert's own thought or any spirit of the times.¹⁰⁶

Bruno was not, however, simply depicting martyrdom in its commonly understood modern sense of wishing for death. What he shows is rather martyrdom in its original sense of "witnessing" to his faith, most clearly shown by death, but also by other means. Bruno does not describe Adalbert as a man with a death-wish, rushing to throw his life down for God as John of Gorze in the tenth century had wished. Instead, the hagiographer takes considerable effort to show his hero as the organizer of a careful mission. When he arrived in Prussian territory, for example, Adalbert was concerned that the pagans

Willigis," p. 21 has suggested that Adalbert chose mission as the only possible way allowed by canon law to separate himself from the duties of his bishopric. But there are other cases of bishops who abdicated to become monks. See Peter Damian's appeal for permission to abdicate from the episcopate, in which he includes as many bishops as possible who were allowed to retire in the past, including Adalbert of Prague. Petrus Damiani, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, MGH Briefe, #57, 2: 162–90. Adalbert's considerable missionary work in Hungary as bishop also shows his very real interest in mission, since as bishop of Prague Adalbert had no real duty or right to evangelize in Hungary. See Bogay, "Adalbert," pp. 22–23. The systematic conversion of Hungary first began with the mission of Adalbert. See Hóman, *König Stephan*, p. 132.

¹⁰³ Reinhard Wenskus, *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt* (Münster/Cologne, 1956), passim.

¹⁰⁴ Bruno, *Vita Adalberti*, (30): 36.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., (18) 23; (24) 29; "felix et incomparabile martyrium," (26): 33.

¹⁰⁶ Jean Leclercq, "Saint Romuald et le monachisme missionnaire" *Rev. Bén.* 72 (1962): 322; Wenskus, see especially p. 135.

might be afraid of him and his companions because of their unusual, monastic clothing. So he suggested to his companions that they should change to lay clothes, let their tonsures and beards grow, live with the pagans, and work with their hands, all of which they did, despite longstanding ecclesiastical legislation against monks wearing any clothing but that of their order.¹⁰⁷ These are not the acts of a man panting for death. Adalbert must have recognized that there was a real danger in his evangelizing pagan territory without the support of a local prince, but that did not deter him. He did not throw away his life, but was willing to give it up if necessary in what he considered a good cause.

The parts of Bruno's account that are most likely true, because they would have been easiest for contemporaries to check up on—the beards, lay clothes, and hand work—also suggest a willingness to set aside specific provisions of the standard monastic life of the ninth and tenth centuries for a good cause. Of course, manual labor entailed a *return* to the Benedictine Rule, but all three actions were abnormal for monastic custom of the time. The desire to evangelize may have been a last, hopeless gesture of an unsuccessful bishop, but it is revealing both of Adalbert and his hagiographer. One must conclude, from the parts of the story that Bruno did *not* emphasize, that Adalbert was attempting a real evangelization of the pagans, by any means possible, even if one rejects the thesis that his goal was martyrdom.

But was Adalbert's longing for martyrdom, poignantly expressed in Bruno's beautifully crafted *vita*, a figment of Bruno's own imagination and a foreshadowing of both Adalbert's and Bruno's own eventual fate? In the hagiography of the turn of the millennium and the eleventh century, Bruno's account was not the only work to emphasize martyrdom in the positive sense of providing a witness to others of the power of the Christian faith. We can see it in the odd story of St. Cholomann, a pilgrim who was mistakenly hanged as a spy in Hungary shortly after the year 1000. Killed while on a pious mission, Cholomann had a great desire to "be dissolved and be with Christ."¹⁰⁸ He was hanged between two thieves, according to the

¹⁰⁷ Bruno, *Vita Adalberti*, (26): 32–33.

¹⁰⁸ "qui solvi et esse cum Christo cupiebat." *Passio S. Cholomanni*, MGH SS 4, (3): 675. This is a very common expression in hagiography. See (3–7): 676ff. for the rest of the story. Thietmar of Merseburg made the tale of Cholomann's death even more edifying. He always refers to Cholomann as "pauper of Christ," a title that

flagrantly christological *vita*. The failure of his body to decay after hanging a year and a half, during which time the corpse in the tree constantly worked miracles, automatically qualified Cholomann for sanctity as a Christ-like figure. One wonders at the union of active and passive—willingness to make a long pilgrimage, combined with the simple desire to die a Christ-like death. As a pilgrim who was hanged by mistake, Cholomann could play both roles. As we will see, almost all the Italian and German monastic reformers of the eleventh century expressed a desire to “witness” in some form, but that could cover many situations. Adalbert got special publicity as a friend of Emperor Otto III. Not all of Adalbert’s fame arose from the support of the short-lived Otto, though. Most chroniclers of the age included mentions of this monk-bishop-martyr, emphasizing his martyrdom; his cult was very important in Hungary and soon spread to the rest of central Europe and even to Russia.¹⁰⁹ People were fascinated with his story and willing to honor him.¹¹⁰

Adalbert, or at least his legend, was an inspiration for many of his contemporaries, but he seems to have particularly struck a chord with the new group of monks drawn together by Romuald of Ravenna, the founder of the Camaldolese congregation. It is traditional to call this group an “eremitical” congregation, since the community attempted to return in many practices to the inspiration of the desert fathers, rather than to current Benedictine practice. Certainly they set themselves up as a return to monastic life as it “should be” conducted in opposition to current practices. And, by accident or choice, one of their reactions against cloistered Benedictinism was missionary work among the pagans. It is a very unlikely coincidence that in 1001 Otto III dedicated a chapel in Romuald’s retreat of Pereum to honor the martyr Adalbert. It is also stretching coincidence rather far that the Camaldolese hermit Bruno of Querfurt wrote an impass-

was affirmed by his wanderings. After he was hanged, the dead tree that had been used as a gibbet and where Cholomann was left hanging suddenly flowered, a sign to all people that Cholomann was a true martyr. Thietmar, (VII.76): 492.

¹⁰⁹ Székely, “Gemeinsame Züge,” p. 58; Voigt, *Adalbert*, p. 200; František Graus, “St. Adalbert und St. Wenzel. Zur Funktion der mittelalterlichen Heiligenverehrung in Böhmen,” in *Europa Slavica—Europa Orientalis*, ed. Klaus-Detlev Grothusen and Klaus Zernack (Berlin, 1980), p. 211; for Russia see Francis Dvornik, “Die Benediktiner und die Christianisierung Rußlands” *Erbe und Auftrag* 35 (1959): 292–310.

¹¹⁰ The cult of Adalbert spread quickly through western Europe. See Gieysztor, “Sanctus,” pp. 611–12. It is also one of the very few cults of the Latin Church that became established in Russia.

sioned *vita* in Adalbert's honor and set out not once but twice to follow in Adalbert's footsteps, eventually dying a martyr to the Prussians twelve years after Adalbert.¹¹¹

In the hermitage with Romuald, Bruno, in collaboration with his friend and patron Otto III, began to plan the evangelization of the many Slavs and Hungarians who were still pagan. It seems clear that the impetus for this plan came from Bruno and the emperor, not from Romuald's eremitical community at Pereum. Before ever becoming a monk, Bruno had assumed the religious name Bonifacius, a choice that very likely shows an emotional link to the great eighth-century missionary.¹¹² According to Peter Damian, Boleslav of Poland sent to the emperor asking for "spiritual men" (*spirituales viros*) to convert his kingdom and the emperor in turn requested monks from Romuald to fill this need, in the time-honored method of emperors who treated monks as their personal property. This account notes that two monks, Iohannes and Benedictus, promptly offered themselves.¹¹³ Still Bruno, in his *Vita quinque fratrum*, a largely first-hand account of the ventures of these two monks and their eventual deaths in Poland with three companions, makes it clear that Romuald at first hesitated to have anything to do with the affair. It was Otto III, not Romuald, who provided for the needs of the new missionary hermitage that was planned in Poland.¹¹⁴ The group agreed that the Camaldolese hermits would form a community in Poland and Bruno would join them later, after he had been consecrated bishop and had obtained a papal license for missionary work.

¹¹¹ Bruno was born c. 974 of high Saxon nobility and followed the usual course of honors for a nobleman entering religious life. He was educated at Magdeburg, as Adalbert had been, and perhaps became a canon there. Probably in 997 he joined Otto III's chapel, and with his family connections he could have expected a bishopric in time. But early in 998 Bruno suddenly gave up his prestigious office and became a monk at Adalbert's former monastery of Sts. Bonifacius and Alexius in Rome, moved, as Peter Damian describes it, by a call from God. For Bruno's early life, see Heinrich G. Voigt, *Brun von Querfurt: Mönch, Eremit, Erzbischof der Heiden und Märtyrer* (Stuttgart, 1907), pp. 17–49. The best contemporary source for Bruno's life is Petrus Damiani's *Vita beati Romualdi*, ed. Giovanni Tabacco (Rome, 1957), (27): 56–60. Soon after becoming a monk Bruno joined Romuald of Ravenna, one of the great moving spirits behind the eremitical movement of the eleventh century and founder of the Camaldolese congregation.

¹¹² The editor of Bruno's *Vita quinque fratrum* suggests that Bruno adopted the name Boniface when he was professed as a monk. Bruno Querfurtensi, *Vita quinque fratrum eremitarum*, MPH series nova, 4,3, p. 27, note 1. Most other authors agree that it was an earlier choice. See Wenskus, pp. 146–47.

¹¹³ Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (28): 61–62.

¹¹⁴ Bruno, *Vita quinque fratrum*, (4): 39.

Bruno addresses a doubt attributed to Gunther the Hermit. Gunther, or at least his hagiographer, had worried that he might fall into the sin of pride by acting in the world. In the case of Bruno and his planned companions, the question is whether it is prideful and sinful to seek martyrdom. Bruno answers firmly: they should not even think of the danger that they may be motivated by longing for glory, or even longing to reach God as quickly as possible. After all, many go without baptism for want of preachers.¹¹⁵ In other words, he is comparing the possible evil of monks falling into sin through vainglory with the certain evil of souls who will be damned without their help. For both Gunther's hagiographers and Bruno, the issue of monastic profession, including as it does a stress not just on stability but also on humility, is subsumed in the greater need to extend God's kingdom on earth. Obviously the doubts arose, if not for the protagonists, then for critics who had to be won over. It is a clear statement that these monks were acting in ways that their contemporaries considered unmonastic. But it is equally clear that, even if they acted in fear and trembling, the role of Christian won out over that of monk, at least in the traditional mold. At least to the hagiographers, these missionaries did not lose their own salvation for the sake of others, since they are acclaimed as saints.

Things did not work out as planned. The five brothers in their hermitage were murdered by thieves before they had really begun their work, oddly enough while they were still learning the language. This almost unique piece of evidence regarding how a real mission was conducted is supported by Bruno's own reminiscence that in a vision the leader of the hermits urged Bruno to learn Slavic while he was held up procuring the papal license.¹¹⁶ The hermits' effort to learn Slavic implies that they actually intended to preach some form of Christian doctrine to the Slavic people, rather than to fix their missionary zeal on the ruler, who would in turn effect the gradual conversion of his land. To win over these pagans, besides learning their language the monks, in both the story of the five brethren and especially that of Adalbert, even gave up their badges of office as monks: the habit and the tonsure.¹¹⁷ It is easy to see that some of the formality of Benedictine life was allowed to slide for the sake of winning

¹¹⁵ Ibid., (2): 37.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., (5): 41.

¹¹⁷ Bruno, *Vita Adalberti*, (26): 33.

new Christians.¹¹⁸ Their death occurred before Bruno was able to join them. Bruno himself was consecrated as missionary bishop in 1004. From early 1003 to 1007 he worked as a missionary to the last sizable Hungarian tribe that was still pagan, then went on for a short time to Russia. He finally led a mission to Prussia, where on 9 March 1009 the Prussians killed him and eighteen companions.¹¹⁹ We have no idea if these companions were fellow monks, servants, or natives.

Bruno of Querfurt's death seems to have been the catalyst for a general awakening of missionary interest among the Camaldolesi. Peter Damian tells in his *Vita Romualdi* that when Romuald heard of Bruno's martyrdom, he became filled with a desire to emulate him. He and twenty-four monks, including two who had been consecrated as archbishops for the pagans, set out for Hungary. Romuald fell ill when they reached the borders of Hungary and had to turn back. But fifteen of the brethren went on to the missionary field, and Peter Damian reports that they enjoyed some success there.¹²⁰

Several historians have argued that mission work was always peripheral to Romuald and his followers.¹²¹ Unfortunately, we have no records of the number of his original followers, but twenty-four was enough to stock two full monasteries and must have been much of the able-bodied workforce at Romuald's command. I believe we can accept Peter Damian's evidence in this case, since, although this *vita* was an early work, his writings were already beginning to show the suspicion of wandering monks and hermits that typifies his later

¹¹⁸ The *vita* of Odo of Cluny states firmly that monks should not adopt any other form of clothing, even with good intentions. John of Salerno, (III.2): 72–73. This view goes back at least to the Anianian reforms of 816 and 817.

¹¹⁹ Dvornik in *Making*, p. 212 suggests that Bruno was originally intended to be metropolitan of East Poland, but that the plans were upset by Otto III's untimely death. Eventually a new diocese was created for Bruno, probably in the region of the Polish-Prussian border. Voigt in *Brun* gives a clear account of Bruno's mission to Hungary, pp. 80–85; see also Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (27): 58–60, which confuses and conflates the visits to Russia and Prussia. Thietmar, (VI.94–95): 386–88 also gives an account of Bruno's death. The *Vita et passio s. Brunonis episcopi et martyris Querfordensis*, MGH SS 30,2: 1350–67 is too late to be useful in this context. See also Voigt, *Brun*, pp. 125–28 for a good summary.

¹²⁰ Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (39): 79–81. The two Camaldolese archbishops to the pagans are mentioned in (33): 71 and (36): 77.

¹²¹ The two main proponents of the view that the early Camaldolesi did not conduct missionary work are Leclercq, "St. Romuald," *passim*; and Wenskus, especially pp. 134–35. Gerd Tellenbach, "Zum Wesen der Cluniacenser" *Saeculum* 9 (1958): 373, in general follows Wenskus' account.

writings. He would not have wanted to describe these events, unless to leave them out would have left a noticeable gap in the story of Romuald. Such a high level of involvement was only possible with a weakening of the chain of the Benedictine Rule. Romuald was a wanderer from the first time he abandoned his monastery until almost the end of his life, as Peter Damian's *vita* makes plain. More interesting, it is not just the leader, the abbot or prior with special privileges and links to the world involved here: it is a large number of Camaldolese hermits. Three Camaldolesi eventually became archbishops to the pagans, but not Romuald, their spiritual director. Surely this is an impressive record, short-lived though it must have been. By the year 1027 the earliest documents of Camaldoli emphasize stability as the greatest good of eremitical/monastic life.¹²² But the first generation, led by a charismatic figure, appears to have had other ideas.

Bruno's life reflected the spirit of his age as it appears in contemporary *vitae*, in which increasingly a monk's monastic identity was not lost even if he became a bishop. He was primarily a monk, even after his archiepiscopal consecration. He kept the monastic round of daily offices and a monastic lifestyle.¹²³ His contemporaries also thought of him as a monk. The chronicler Thietmar of Merseburg, who was a relative of Bruno's and probably knew him, describes Bruno's final missionary venture as taking place in the twelfth year of his conversion, that is, after his entry into the monastery of Sts. Bonifacius and Alexius. Another annal lists the martyrdom as eleven years after Bruno's conversion, and described Bruno as "archbishop and monk."¹²⁴

Much has been made of Bruno of Querfurt's longing for martyrdom, a very pronounced element in his literary works. What their pages reveal, though, is not simply a longing "to be dissolved and be with Christ," although that sentiment appears.¹²⁵ It has been suggested that Bruno saw a natural progression in religious life: from monasticism to eremitism, and finally, for a select few, to martyr-

¹²² See Wilhelm Kurze, "Campus Malduli. Die Frühgeschichte Camaldolis" *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 44 (1964): 1-34, especially pp. 7-8. See also my article "Peter Damian against the Reformers," in *The Joy of Learning and the Love of God: Studies in Honor of Jean Leclercq*, ed. E. Rozanne Elder (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 67-94.

¹²³ Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (27): 57.

¹²⁴ Thietmar, (VI.95): 388; *Annales Quedlinburgenses* [a. 1009], p. 80.

¹²⁵ "cupientibus dissolui et esse cum Christo." Bruno, *Vita fratrum*, (2): 35.

dom.¹²⁶ However, when he speaks of this move to more blessed life, as also in his *vita* of Adalbert, it is more to a martyr's life than a martyr's death that he is referring.

The *Vita quinque fratrum* includes a fascinating account of Otto III's vow to leave the world and join an eremitical community:

Because of these things [a bloody attack on Rome, for which Otto felt pangs of guilt, thanks largely to Romuald], the glorious Caesar thought to go to Slavia, to those brethren from the hermitage who were fervent in spirit, so that in a secret place in the beautiful forest, they might construct a monastery on the border of the pagan lands. And they were following the three proper ways of seeking the Lord. That is: the monastery is desirable for those newly coming from the world; for the mature and those knowing God, golden solitude; and for those desiring to be dissolved and be with Christ, the mission to the pagans.¹²⁷

The would-be martyr actively seeks to carry the gospel to the pagans; of course a very real risk is involved, but he should have firm hopes of converting needy souls to Christianity. To be dissolved and be with Christ does not necessarily mean death, but could also signify the complete association of self with God's work, so that the individual personality becomes lost.

Just as a period in a monastery prepares an ascetic for life in a hermitage, the eremitical life prepares the dedicated practitioner for mission. Bruno saw this as a logical progression.¹²⁸ In general he considered any ascetic life a preparation for spreading the gospel, as is clear from other passages in his works. But he also recognized that this connection would seem unusual to many of his readers, as it must have seemed to his fellow disciples under Romuald's rule. Above all, he stressed, it should not be considered sinful and prideful to seek martyrdom, two faults especially to be abhorred by the properly humble monk. The potential missionary should not even think of the possibility that he is offending against monastic humility at a time

¹²⁶ See for example Voigt, *Bruno*, p. 156.

¹²⁷ "Huius rei gratia fratres ex heremo, qui essent ferventes spiritu in Sclavoniam dirigere gloriosus cesar cogitavit, ut ubi pulchra silva secretum daret, in christiana terra iuxta terminum paganorum monasterium construerent, essentque tripla commoda querentibus viam Domini, hoc est: noviter venientibus de seculo desiderabile cenobium, maturis vero et Deum vivum scientibus aurea solitudo, cupientibus dissolui et esse cum Christo evangelium paganorum." Bruno, *Vita fratrum*, (2): 35.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, (2): 36-37.

when so many do not even have the beginning grace of baptism.¹²⁹ This statement bears emphasis. We can see from such a statement that some sector of the population considered it improper for monks to be so active in the world. Monastic humility is cited in Bruno's case; others might call the same attitude of separation monastic pride. In either case, Bruno is speaking directly to critics who disapproved of monks wandering about outside of their cloisters.

Again, martyrdom is almost a synonym for evangelization; the compelling *raison d'être* for martyrdom was to teach Christianity to those still wrapped in the darkness of paganism. The men Bruno describes went to great efforts to prepare themselves for a long period of evangelization, learning Slavic, becoming familiar with the area in which they planned to work, waiting eagerly for the apostolic license that would give full authority and legality to their work. They did not rush out in ignorant enthusiasm to die for their faith.¹³⁰

Bruno's attitude toward mission is predicated on a notion of spiritual perfection. The best monks were called to evangelization, precisely because they *were* better than other humans, more attuned to this special duty to God and humanity. Nevertheless, although it takes long training in monastery and hermitage to reach such a state, mission is a logical conclusion to all that asceticism, rather than an aberration. There is none of the traditional monastic sense in Bruno's apologia that an active stance toward the world will sully monks; instead, their lives enable them to act as conduits of grace.

Although doors appear to have been opening between Rimbart's time and the twelfth century, whether or not a monk was right to leave the cloister to engage in missionary work was a matter for doubt and questioning, both to the monk and to those around him. Authorities were hesitant to accept the propriety of such cases. Observers were more used to monks who were stable in a monastery, only a few officers going out to conduct business. Such people naturally assumed bad motives for any wanderer. Bishop Pilgrim of Passau, as we have seen, quickly recalled Wolfgang from Hungary, and questioned him carefully to find if he was in fact a holy man. Before he sanctioned Wolfgang's journey to Hungary, Pilgrim found it necessary to "test" him, doubtless with questions about his background

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid., (4): 41.

and faith and a command that he celebrate the Eucharist to prove his purity, before he sanctioned Wolfgang's journey to Hungary.

The most avid reformers were wary of allowing their disciples out on the evangelizing road too easily. There is a story of how Gunther, himself a noted evangelist and wanderer from the strict stability of Benedictine monasticism, was approached by one of his followers, a monk named Tammo. Led by pride, as the hagiographer says, this monk requested the right to undertake mission in these terms: "We are not ignorant that according to the precedents of the fathers, one ought never leave his [monastic] cell, except when called. But in our humility, we can go out following the precepts of our lord Jesus Christ, that have been given generously to you and others." Tammo's case was special, however. He went on to say that Christ had visited him in the night and commanded: "that I [Tammo] should correct and renew the monasteries of Noricum to conform to the rule, and that I should preach the word of God to the people [*populis*]." He should also heal two brethren of the monastery and restore Gunther's own sight. Gunther was clever enough, says the author, to recognize this as a diabolical delusion, and gave Tammo strict penances instead of the mission he craved.¹³¹ The story helps demonstrate the problems a monk-missionary faced even before he confronted the pagans. Were early monastic venturers motivated by pride or by a willingness to live out the precept "love your neighbor"? The wisest of the monk missionaries walked a moral tightrope between tradition and present need. Who is to determine when the Benedictine Rule should be set aside? Is the inspiration for a monk to leave his cloister just the pretense of religion and the devil's work, or do his wishes come from the urging of the Holy Spirit?

¹³¹ "Non ignoramus, quia iuxta instituta patrum nisi vocati de cella egredi et huc venire minime debueramus; sed humilitatis nostrae adventus ex praecepto domini nostri Iesu Christi est vobis et aliis valde necessarius. . . . ut in monasteriis Norici regulares observationes corrigam et renovem, atque populis late verbum Dei predicem . . ." Arnoldus, (II.66): 572–73. See also Lang, p. 25.

CHAPTER THREE

STABILITY AND CARE: THE RECLUSES

Many monks of the tenth and eleventh centuries explored and amended the idea of the spiritual life to which they were committed. This exploration pulled them toward active involvement with the world in a variety of ways. This impetus moved out into the dangerous world of the missionary. It also, in a seeming paradox, moved many to a life of reclusion as the best means to serve their neighbors.

The time has come to examine more closely the models of behavior that motivated monks, both those holding to traditional norms and those who became more active in the world. Central to the arguments of all parties, as we have seen, was the issue of stability, usually physical stability as vowed by each monk upon profession.¹ In the last chapter, we have seen monks fighting or finding ways to justify the restraints of stability. What adds to the puzzle is the meaning of stability and the meaning of separation itself for the men and women involved. (It is possible to speak of women here, because when people reached the highest ranks of spiritual perfection, gender ceased to be an issue.) In my research, the most paradoxical evidence I encountered is that recluses—the order of society most strictly bound to perpetual stability—also appear to have been a very important model for monks eager to act among the laity. These recluses were also the “holy people” par excellence of their society, living a life of virtue that empowered them for service to others more than could the life in even the most rigorous monastery. I first questioned the role of recluses years ago, when I discovered a *Rule for Recluses* whose author had drawn heavily on Gregory the Great’s *Pastoral Care* for inspiration. This author, Grimlaicus, had packed his *Rule* with advice on how to deal with various sorts of people as a spiritual advisor, how to remain pure while active in the world, and so on.² It soon became plain to me that my definition of “recluse”

¹ RB 58.17.

² This work, discussed at length in this chapter, is Grimlaicus’ *Regula solitiorum*, PL 103: 573–664.

was much too limited for the phenomenon as it existed in the tenth century. Thus began a hunt that led in the end to a definition of stability alternative to that of most monks of the time of my study, and to an attitude toward personal holiness that not only allowed but compelled care of the laity. These recluses provide, I believe, a vital clue to the shift in attitude that made the diversification of Benedictine monasticism not only possible but necessary.

The reformed monks of the tenth century could talk about their paradise on earth, their angelic nature, and even their superior prayer powers compared to those of the laity. The tenth-century literature includes much to make one feel that these monks, whether those in the cloister or the few who ventured into worldly activity, actually thought of themselves as "super monks," since their prayers were so powerful and their lives so withdrawn from the world. Recluses for their part could well have claimed (although prevented by humility) to be super-super monks or nuns. In this period recluses were usually professed monks or nuns, who took their vows of separation from the world one step further by vowing permanent residence in a small cell, normally attached to a monastery or a church. Thus far they fit ideally with the Benedictine ideology in place by the early ninth century. Still, recluses were different from ordinary monks. Almost every one mentioned in the extant sources is praised as a spiritual advisor, often with prophetic powers, who was a center of religious instruction and empowerment for an entire region. Physical contact was impossible because of their vows, but verbal contact with the laity and other religious appears to have been part of their daily lives. This stands in stark contrast to monks of the reformed houses, whose customaries urged them to avoid contact, including speech, with the laity, for fear of the pollution with which even such well-regulated monks could become tainted.³

³ The earliest extant customary after the period of the Carolingian reforms is the *Regularis Concordia Anglica Nationis Monachorum Sanctimonialiumque*, most recently attributed to Aethelwold, trans. and ed. Thomas Symons (London, 1953). It dates to the reign of the English King Edgar (959–75). Since the revitalized monastic institute in England was based on the reforms of both Gorze and Brogne, as well as Cluny, it is reasonable to take this document as a reflection of reformed monasticism on the Continent. It is in basic agreement with the *Consuetudines Floriacenses Antiquiores*, ed. Anselmus Davril and Linus Donnat, CCM VII.3, pp. 3–60, written sometime in the tenth century, and with the tenth-century *Consuetudines Germaniae: Redactio sancti Emmerammi, dicta Einsidlensis (E)*, in the same volume, pp. 187–256, as well as with eleventh-century customaries.

I believe that to understand the evolution of some monks in this period toward a more active involvement in care of the world, it is necessary to comprehend the central medieval notion of the recluse—the person so far withdrawn from the normal round of the world that he or she becomes a spiritual force for others. Such a person bears some similarity to the hermit; like the hermit, the recluse was expected to live in isolation, the better to commune with God. Unlike the freely roving hermits, though, recluses vowed themselves to perpetual confinement in a small area, usually a cell attached to a monastic or parish church. How to be so holy that one could be safe from danger of imminent fall even while communicating daily with the laity appears to have passed down the ranks from the recluses, to important and saintly abbots, then in a gradual process beginning in the second half of the tenth century, to ordinary monks. An analysis of what made recluses so special will lead us far in grasping the underlying mentality of an age in which some monks began to take up work in the world, claiming it to be their right *as* monks rather than making them renegades to the Rule.

Source materials dealing with recluses and the institution of enclosure provide a highly varied and often confusing picture of the movement. Monks wrote a large majority of these works, including almost all the *vitae* and most of the chronicles. There are also some letters, by both monks and other churchmen, references in imperial letter collections and necrologies, and two plays by the nun Hrotsvith of Gandersheim. I have already mentioned one of the most important sources, the “Rule for Recluses” (*Regula solitariorum*) traditionally attributed to a recluse named Grimlaicus.⁴ These sources vary con-

⁴ Grimlaicus, *Regula solitariorum*. I believe the most likely date and place of this work is c. 950 in Lotharingia. Jean Leclercq in his “Jean de Gorze et la vie religieuse au X^e siècle,” in *Saint Chrodegang* (Metz, 1967), pp. 133–52 argues for a date during the episcopacy of Robert of Metz (883–917) and hypothesizes that the Rule was later used by the early community at Gorze. His argument is based especially on the use of the same technical terms by Grimlaicus and the author of John of Gorze’s *vita*. He also points out that the anti-Jewish elements in Grimlaicus could stem from anti-Jewish ordinances by Robert of Metz. Jean Leclercq, “Reclus et recluses à Metz durant le moyen âge” *Revue ecclésiastique de Metz* 53 (1953): 21, 24. I feel that too many other works on recluses have all or parts of the vocabulary shown in the *Regula solitariorum* to find Leclercq’s argument convincing. It is clear that Grimlaicus wrote trying to organize uncontained hermits and recluses, such as those who fill the pages of the *vita* of John of Gorze. There was also strong feeling against Jews in c. 950, at about the time I believe Grimlaicus wrote. My argument rests especially on analysis of the use of scripture in florilegia, which is essentially the character of the *Rule*. Florilegia from the ninth and early tenth centuries make more use

siderably in their understanding of the reclusive religious life. All agree, though, that unlike monks, their subjects interacted frequently with lay and ecclesiastical society. A typical *vita* of the tenth century depicts the main monastic virtues as humility and a generosity carefully detached from the laity. Only rarely does the author even mention monks' interaction with the laity in any but the briefest and most impersonal form. Authors describe good recluses, though, in full communication with the laity, especially giving spiritual support and instruction. This appears often enough to justify claiming interaction with the laity as a typical part of reclusive life. This interaction is described with so much variety and so many encounters with recluses are merely mentioned in passing during a larger narrative scene that I find it extremely likely that these accounts describe a truly popular phenomenon, rather than just being employed as a hagiographical device.

i. *The growing popularity of reclusion*

Most of us are more familiar with the hermit than the recluse as the model for medieval solitary life. Romances from the later middle ages tell of hermits who had escaped to a life of prayer in solitude, living in huts in the forest. Countless knights errant lodged with hermits—some even became hermits to expiate the sins of their secular life. Given the difficulty of supplying oneself with food and surviving cold western European winters, hermits were probably never as common, especially north of the Alps, as literature leads us to suspect.

of the wisdom literature compared to collections made after c. 950. Grimlaicus, however, subordinates wisdom literature to second place after the gospels, especially Matthew, a style of interest and reference that only gradually developed. Another possible piece of evidence for values held by recluses is Adalgerus' *Admonitio ad Nonsuindam reclusam*, a tract on the ascetic life found in PL 134: 915–38. This is an adaptation of a text probably written in the second half of the seventh century. The oldest manuscript of the Adalgerus rescension was written sometime in the ninth or tenth century, so it is possible that it appeared in the ninth century in response to an interest in recluses. See Alberto Vaccari, "Un trattato ascetico attribuito a S. Girolamo," in *Mélanges offerts au R.P. Ferdinand Cavallera* (Toulouse, 1948), pp. 147–62. It is certainly not a work of the latter part of the tenth century, as is claimed in the PL edition and frequently accepted by modern scholars, and cannot be taken as evidence for tenth-century values. The Bamberg Rule for recluses, although several times hailed as the earliest rule for recluses in the West, is certainly a work of the twelfth century. See *Ordo inclusorum*, in *Bavaria sancta*, ed. Mattias Raderus (Munich, 1627), 3: 115–16.

The eremitical life, it is plain, also attracted widely varying amounts of interest at various periods in the middle ages. It had been very popular in Late Antiquity, and the body of literature about the Fathers of the Egyptian desert ensured a continuing interest in at least the idea of withdrawal far from contact with fellow humans, even after the practice became more limited.

In the central middle ages, however, the period roughly from 800 to 1050, reclusion gradually displaced eremitism as the dominant vehicle for expression of rigorous asceticism, at least in the Germanic lands that are the focus of this study. The available evidence suggests that reclusion grew in popularity toward the middle of the ninth century, at roughly the same time as the ironbound codification of Benedictine stability with the reforms of Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane. Since the phenomenon has received very little attention from scholars, calculating clear dates and estimates of its diffusion is difficult. Certainly reclusion existed in some form from early Christian times, but the great period of its expansion occurred apparently in the ninth century.⁵ It was in the years following 850 that significant numbers of recluses began to appear. Three renowned recluses died in the years 865, 878, and 884: Liutbirga, Findan of Rheinau, and Eusebius.⁶ From about 900 on, reclusion clearly attracted considerable popular interest. Several important *vitae* of recluses appeared

⁵ Armin Basedow, *Die Inklusen in Deutschland vornehmlich in der Gegend des Niederrheins um die Wende des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts* (Heidelberg, 1895), p. 5; Friedrich Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis des Ruogier. Ihre historiographische und ideengeschichtliche Stellung* (Bonn, 1958), p. 16. However, the only cases of recluses in the early ninth century I have been able to find have been Dungalus Scottus; Hardouin of Fontanelle (d. 811) (see *Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium*, MGH SS 2, (16): 292), who does not seem to have been a true recluse; and St. Liutbirga (fl. 835–865), whose fame leaves the impression that the phenomenon was more widespread, but also suggests something of a circus side-show—that because she was a rarity people would come from near and far to see her for themselves (see *Das Leben der Liutbirg*, Ottokar Menzel, ed., MGH Deutsches Mittelalter 3). Walther Grosse, “Das Kloster Wendhausen, sein Stiftergeschlecht und seine Klausnerin” *Sachsen und Anhalt* 16 (1940): 56 points out that reclusion was totally unknown in Saxony before Liutbirga’s time. Eva Irblich argues that reclusion only began to take root at the beginning of the tenth century, but I believe she puts it too late. See *Die Vitae Sanctae Wiboradae. Ein Heiligen-Leben des 10. Jahrhunderts als Zeitbild* (St. Gallen, 1970), p. 9.

⁶ See *Vita Liutbirgae* and Grosse, p. 56 for Liutbirga; the *vita* of St. Findan is found in MGH SS 15,1: 502–6; Eusebius is mentioned in the *Casus s. Galli*, MGH SS 2, (2): 93 and the *Rhythmi de sancto Otmaro* from St. Gall, MGH SS 2: 56. See also Johannes Duft, “Die Beziehungen zwischen Irland und St. Gallen im Rahmen der St. Gallischen Stifts-Geschichte,” in *Die irischen Miniaturen der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen*, ed. Duft and Peter Mayer (Olben, 1953), p. 34.

in the tenth century and references to them became common in annals and other historical sources. There are also a number of tenth-century cases of men and women leading a semi-enclosed life in emulation of true recluses. For example, the early Gorzian Einoldus, although he was archdeacon of Toul, left his cell only to participate in religious services. Wendelgart, the niece of Otto I, when she thought her husband was dead, had a cell built next to the cell of Wiborada at St. Gall and lived there as a recluse, giving alms to the brethren of the monastery and the poor.⁷ The cases I will use here and the twentieth-century scholarship on the issue demonstrate that many recluses lived in both France and Germany in the tenth and eleventh centuries and, indeed, that reclusion was a characteristic feature of the religious life of the tenth century.⁸

The timing of this upsurge in reclusion is suggestive. It is in some ways analogous to the situation ascetics faced after the triumph of the Church in the fourth century. Many monasteries before the ninth century appear to have been grossly irregular, allowing monks to hold property, neglecting prayer, and at times even permitting concubinage and free intercourse with the world. In such circumstances it took little enough effort to reach a comfortable feeling of godliness, as was the simple fact of being a Christian in the shadow of possible persecution.⁹ But the early ninth-century Anianian reform

⁷ Iohannes s. Arnulfi, *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis*, MGH SS 4, (29): 345; *Casus s. Galli*, (10): 119–120. This woman was not a true recluse, since when her husband, who had only been captured in battle rather than killed, was ransomed, she returned to secular life. An early eleventh-century semi-recluse who won considerable fame was Herveus of Tours (d. 1022). See Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford, 1989), (III.14–15): 120; analysis in Guy Oury, “L’idéal monastique dans la vie canoniale. Le bienheureux Hervé de Tours (†1022)” *Rev. Mabillon* 52 (1962): 25. Many early Gorzians were semi-recluses. See Iohannes s. Arnulfi, *passim*; also Jean Leclercq, “Reclus,” p. 357; Jacques Choux, “Décadence et réforme monastique dans la province de Trèves 855–959” *Rev. Bén.* 70 (1960): 217 for other examples.

⁸ See Louis Gougaud, *Ermîtes et reclus* (Vienne, 1928), p. 77; Jean Hubert, “L’érémisme et l’archéologie,” in *L’Eremitismo in occidente*, Settimana Mendola 2 (1965), p. 477; and Otmar Doerr, *Das Institut der Einsamen in Süddeutschland* (Münster, 1934), p. 71 on the numbers of recluses in the period. Ludwig Zoepf, in his ground-breaking and still very useful book *Das Heiligen-Leben im 10. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1908, reprint ed. Hildesheim, 1973) suggests that the religious life of the tenth century is characterized by monasticism, reclusion, and martyrdom. See especially p. 131.

⁹ The best sources for the quality of monasticism before the ninth century are the capitularies of Charlemagne regulating monastic behavior and the reform legislation of 816 and 817, the latter published in the first volume of CCM. Of course both sources were propagated by men who were trying to impose a new, strictly

set society's seal of approval on a trend that was already underway—monks following the Benedictine Rule and leading lives of ritual purity. While there was decline and destruction in some monasteries during the invasions and civil wars of the ninth century, the most recent studies suggest that the case for the dissolution of monastic life at that time has been gravely overstated.¹⁰ The advent of new “reformed” congregations in the tenth century, such as Cluny, Gorze, and Brogne, ensured at least outward conformity to this Benedictine/Anianian life, while imposing structure that went beyond the individual monastery. Therefore the zealots of the age, uncertain of the grace of a harsh God, turned in large numbers to asceticism, in this case reclusion, as had their fellows of the desert in the fourth and fifth centuries.

Two of the reasons for this great increase in the popularity of reclusion instead of another rigorous religious form are the high esteem in which most western Christians held monasticism and the attraction of stability as the ideal means to effect the withdrawal of ascetics from the world. This attraction operated at two levels, that of religious authorities and that of the ascetics themselves. Monks and administrators alike were more aware of the demands for an orderly religious life, which they in turn attempted to impose upon the virtuosi in asceticism, those who wanted more than the routine prayer life of the monastery. Stability was in vogue, especially as the breakdown of the Carolingian Empire put security and order at a premium. But reclusion was more than simply a variety of super monasticism, operating by the same principles as Benedictine monasticism, but to a higher degree. Reclusion is also an outgrowth of eremitism, although in this period it took a distinctive path that led away from the spirituality of the desert. At this time the reclusive life became more clearly separated from traditional eremitism, and became characterized especially by the stress placed on stability to a single place.¹¹ Thus, reclusion became something that was neither

Benedictine system upon older monasteries, so are likely to have painted as black a picture as possible of monastic life before they swept in to save it.

¹⁰ Choux, pp. 204–23 provides a good summary of the issue of monks and their problems during the Viking and Saracen invasions and the long civil war between Charlemagne's descendants. See also Margaret Gibson, “The Continuity of Learning, c. 850–c. 1050” *Viator* 6 (1975): 1–13.

¹¹ The recluses described in Gregory of Tours' *History of the Franks*, ed. and trans. Lewis Thorpe (Penguin, 1974) delighted in violent, life-threatening asceticism. He describes long fasts and chains as standard. Reclusion as depicted in the ninth century and later is at least more carefully monitored, if not always gentler.

eremitism nor monasticism and in some ways anticipated the spirituality of the later middle ages. The traditional hermit, wandering to the "wilderness" (which could mean anything from a mountainous cave to the outskirts of a city, or even part of a city, such as a cemetery), could rarely compete in holiness with the recluse. This applies at least to the hermits about which we have information. Leclercq has pointed out very aptly that the hermits about which we hear are those who did not lead a proper eremitical life of escape from the world, and that probably many hermits vanished from human contact and documentation.¹² But both the religious climate of the ninth and tenth centuries and civil legislation that began before the Council of Chalcedon (451) opposed the notion of a wandering, unregulated holy man, while a wandering holy woman faced almost certain rape.

Hermits were the great role-models for the early medieval Church, but reclusion as a distinctive offshoot of eremitism soon took on a life of its own. As one can tell from the work of Brown and Rousseau, both ecclesiastical and secular authorities early in the history of Christianity took a stand against wandering clergy, reaching a high point with the Council of Chalcedon, and urged ascetics to join regular, regulated communities, steps that worked against disorganized and frequently vagabond hermits. Ascetics themselves gradually turned against wandering eremitism in favor of isolation in a fixed place. Along with much praise of wandering and flight from the world, the *Sayings of the Fathers* also included several exhortations to stability and at least one to reclusion.¹³ There are several other early references to reclusion, but it frequently appears just as a radical form of eremitical asceticism, as with St. Simeon Stylites. As such, people of all ages could undertake it. Pope Stephen II (752-757) in a letter to King Pippin told of recluses "who handed themselves over to enclosure from the age of childhood or puberty for the love of God" (while complaining that they were raped and murdered during

¹² Jean Leclercq, "L'érémisme en Occident jusqu'à l'an mil," In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, p. 28.

¹³ Mark the Egyptian spent thirty years without leaving his cell. *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, trans. Benedicta Ward (Kalamazoo, 1975), (Mark the Egyptian. 1): 150. More common are general admonitions not to wander; Syncletica, one of the rare female hermits of the desert, likened wandering from monastery to monastery to a bird abandoning her nest so the eggs get cold. *Sayings*, (Syncletica. 6): 231; see also Antony in *Sayings*, (Anthony the Great. 3,10): 2, 3.

an attack on Rome by the Lombard king Aistulph).¹⁴ The name "recluse" took on a firm definition as a person permanently vowed to withdrawal and stability only in the central middle ages.¹⁵ Early medieval examples do not make it clear whether or not reclusion was considered a permanent enclosure, an irrevocable vow to remain in a cell alone.¹⁶

By the ninth century, reclusion had a fixed and permanent structure, organized with an eye to placing this form of asceticism firmly under the control of ecclesiastical authorities and clearly considered as an outgrowth of cenobitism. Grimlaicus describes clearly the steps along the road to becoming a recluse, the general outlines of which are confirmed by other references. The first stage is to get a license to become a recluse, which must be obtained from the diocesan bishop, and also requires the consent of the abbot and brethren of the monastery involved.¹⁷ Then the novice-recluse should undertake a trial period of at least one year, which Grimlaicus describes as living with the brethren, but never setting foot outside of the cloister.¹⁸ After the novitiate, the bishop would come to the location decided upon as the place for enclosure, and the recluse would be shut up in a

¹⁴ Stephanus II, *Epistolae et Decreta*, ep. 4, PL 89: 1000. See also the tale told by Gregory of Tours of a twelve-year-old boy who became a recluse and went mad after several years of confinement. Gregory of Tours, *History*, (VIII.34): 468.

¹⁵ An interesting example of this new emphasis on permanence in reclusion can be found in Hrotsvith of Gandersheim's play *Abraham*. In her sixth-century source, Abraham is clearly described as a recluse, and is shown closed up in an inner cell, which he leaves only to rescue his niece from her fallen life as a prostitute. But Hrotsvith was clearly unable to accept this account of leaving his cell as fitting for a recluse, so she makes Abraham a hermit, almost the only liberty she takes with the original story. See Hrotsvith, *Abraham*, in *Hrotsvithae opera*, ed. H. Homeyer (Munich, 1970). The source is the *Vita s. Abrahae eremita*, PL 73: 281–92; 651–60.

¹⁶ Gregory of Tours describes several recluses. See Gregory of Tours, *History*, (VI.6): 333–37; p. 468; *Liber de gloria confessorum*, PL 71, (23): 847–48, (English translation Raymond Van Dam (Liverpool, 1988), pp. 38–39. He also has an interesting account of a would-be stylite, who was ordered by his bishop to get down from his pillar, which was destroyed while he was absent. Gregory of Tours, *History*, (VIII.15): 446–47. Clearly eastern ascetic practices were not always wholeheartedly supported. Arnulf of Metz spent part of his life as a recluse, as did St. Amandus, the apostle of Belgium. See Grimlaicus, (1): 579; Friedrich Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Munich/Vienna, 1965), p. 304.

¹⁷ Grimlaicus, col. 593. Also seen in *Vita Liutbirgae*, p. 25. The Trullian council of 692 ordered that a bishop examine prospective recluses. Mansi, 11: 963.

¹⁸ Grimlaicus, (15): 593. The Trullian council already cited requires a three year trial period in a monastery. Mansi, 11: 963. Wiborada is credited by her hagiographer with such a three-year probation, although the time elapsed was actually four years, a sign that this Trullian canon was known to the author of her *vita*. Hartmannus monachus s. Galli, *Vita I Wiboradae*, AASS Mai II, (II.15): 291.

specially prepared cell. He or she was forbidden to leave the cell again and was then blessed with prayers for persistence in this resolve. Grimlaicus gives the earliest example of the cell being sealed with the bishop's signet; in other cases the new recluse appears to have been walled in.¹⁹

It is clear that after enclosure no return to the world would be permitted. The Trullian Council of 692 allows only "common utility" or danger of death as exceptions to this rule; Grimlaicus further limits this to "inevitable necessity," recommending excommunication in all other cases.²⁰ To limit temptation, the recluse's cell should be firmly built and surrounded with walls, so the recluse would be unable to "wander" and others could not enter. Communication with the outside world is to be held through a window, placed so it would be difficult either to see visitors or be seen by them. Again a main reason for this was so the recluse would not be tempted to leave.²¹

It is useful to have the case of a recluse on the occasion of her enclosure before us for analysis. Shortly after the year 1000, a woman named Caritas asked Bishop Burchard of Worms for permission to become a recluse. Already a nun, she requested "a higher and greater rigor of life" from the bishop. After carefully examining her spirituality, Burchard agreed and arranged a day on which he would come to her convent to perform the ceremony for reclusion. When the day came and the nuns and clerics had assembled, Burchard lectured to all present on the virtue of this woman who was giving up the world for love of God. He went on: both old and young should be ashamed that they were not acting similarly. Burchard lauds Caritas' decision as an example to follow: "Behold this fragile maiden goes intrepidly before you with upright standard and has not feared to

¹⁹ Grimlaicus, (15): 593-94. There are good descriptions of the enclosure ceremony in Hartmannus, (II.15) 291; *Vita Liutbirgae*, (22): 25; Eberwinus, *Vita s. Symeonis*, AASS Iun. I, (15): 89. The last example describes how Archbishop Poppo came to enclose Simeon, "and devoutly buried him as if he were dead, as he truly was to the world" (*et quasi mortuum, ut vere erat seculo, devotissime sepelivit*). Hrotsvith's play *Pafnutius* describes how the repentant prostitute Thaïs was put into a narrow, solitary cell with neither entrance nor exit, but only a narrow window so she could be provided with food. Hrotsvith, *Pafnutius*, p. 342.

²⁰ Mansi, 11: 963; Grimlaicus, (69): 662. The seventh council of Toledo ruled in 684 that recluses should not be allowed to wander. Mansi, 10: 769-70. Grimlaicus tells the story of a recluse who, through his avarice, was beguiled by the devil into leaving his cell, thus, we are told, casting a bad light on all recluses. Grimlaicus, (7): 585.

²¹ Grimlaicus, (16): 594.

fight against spiritual evils," and he added in Pauline language that she is armed with the shield of faith and the helmet of salvation (Eph 6.16–17). After this sermon, the bishop completed mass and then enclosed the new recluse in a small cell adjacent to the convent church, reading the office for the dead over her, "since because of divine compunction she was dead to worldly things." Caritas lived for the next three years never leaving this cell, tested by various temptations, but, the hagiographer tells us, succeeded in living an "angelic life." Then "at the end she rendered her soul, fully purified, to the Creator."²²

This short account in the *vita* of Bishop Burchard of Worms contains most elements typical of recluses in the period of this study. The recluse described here was already a member of a religious community, who received permission from her diocesan bishop before her enclosure. Reclusion is clearly a permanent state, indeed the most stable possible state: the recluse was locked up, or even walled up, in a cell where she was expected to remain for the rest of her life. The celebration of a Requiem mass emphasizes this. Symbolically, Caritas had died and was now being buried to the world and would never emerge again. Finally, oddest of all to twentieth-century mentalities, Caritas' decision receives the most vigorous praise, while the bishop reproaches those who are content to be "mere" monks or nuns for the lukewarmness of their love of God. The eleventh-century author certainly does not believe that the reclusion he describes is escapism, a refusal to deal with the world and its problems. Instead, to the author of this account, and probably to most of his contemporaries, reclusion is the highest possible expression of love of God, and, as we will see, of love of the rest of humanity.

ii. *Separation and liminality*

To put the phenomenon of reclusion in its proper context, one must first examine the more general issue of flight into solitude, especially its appeal and the extent to which it was a motivating force for recluses. Since the publication of Brown's "The Rise and Function of

²² *Vita Burchardi episcopi Wormatiensis*, MGH SS 4, (13): 838–39. This *vita* was written within a few years of Burchard's death in 1025 by a cleric of Worms, who appears to have known the bishop well.

the Holy Man in Late Antiquity" it has become ever more clear that a formal disconnection from the world could endow a person with a special link to God in popular perception that in turn those without a flair for flagrant asceticism could tap.²³ Our sources drew directly on the tradition that informed Brown's study. The greatest authorities to which the writers of the ninth through eleventh centuries turned when discussing recluses were the Fathers of the Egyptian and Syrian deserts, especially through the medium of John Cassian, who was widely read in Western monasteries. The lesson learned was not simply of flight, but more especially the liminality of these sanctified individuals. Certainly many early hermits of the near East took great pains to avoid their fellow humans, often in ways that seem comic or disgusting to modern readers, such as Simeon perching atop his pillar or Arsenius, who convinced an archbishop not to come see him, because if he did, Arsenius would flee even further into the desert than he was already.²⁴ Indeed, the word "anchorite," which is still commonly used to describe both recluses and hermits, comes from the Greek verb "ἀναχωρεῖν," to pull oneself back.²⁵ The *Sayings of the Desert Fathers* repeat often that the way of salvation lies in flight.²⁶

The goal, of course, was for the anchorite "to have his mind freed from all earthly things, and to unite it, as far as human frailty allows, with Christ."²⁷ These practitioners of holiness assumed that the world is distracting and that God can best be found in solitude, an axiom that few questioned in the middle ages. What is meant by "the world," though? This was the great question that divided reclusion from monasticism in the ninth century. The authors do not explain what was obviously clear to them, but one can see a shift of

²³ See Peter Brown's justly famed article, "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity," in Brown's *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1982), pp. 103–52.

²⁴ *Sayings*, (Arsenius. 8): 10.

²⁵ Uwe Kai Jacobs, *Die Regula Benedicti als Rechtsbuch* (Cologne/Vienna, 1987), p. 8.

²⁶ Arsenius was told by a heavenly voice that the sources of sinlessness are to "flee, be silent, pray always." *Sayings*, (Arsenius. 2): 9. Elsewhere in the *Sayings*, Abbot Moses compares a man fleeing his fellow humans to a ripe grape, while one who interacts with others is likened to a sour grape. *Sayings*, (Moses. 7): 140. Both examples are specifically applied to recluses by Grimlaicus, (14): 591. The early hermit Poemen was exhorted to consider himself already dead and in the tomb for a year. *Sayings*, (Poemen. 2): 138.

²⁷ John Cassian, *The Conferences*, trans. Edgar Gibson, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 2nd series, vol. 11 (Grand Rapids, reprint ed. 1978), (XIX.8): 492–93 (SC 64, pp. 45–46).

meaning of the word over time and with different groups. An early danger for Christian ascetics was that of falling into Manichaeism, a dualistic division of the world in which Satan created the visible world (including the human body) and God created spiritual things such as the human soul. Mainstream Christianity condemned this view, but did not eliminate the strong dichotomy inherited from Platonism of some form of conflict between body and soul. The soul wants to reach God; distractions of the world continue to pull it down again. For the ascetics of Late Antiquity, the desert as compared to the sights and sounds of the populated world is more an interior state of aloneness than a physical location. It is the temple of God; a place of silence and secret joy, as an early fifth-century theologian described it.²⁸ Quiet of both spirit and flesh was considered necessary to be close to God and to keep his commandments.²⁹ Many Christians, in the middle ages and since, have made occasional retreats for private prayer and meditation.³⁰ Besides individual withdrawal, entire groups went to form monasteries in places of "solitude," a descriptive term that was usually understood more as a place in which an ascetic life could be led without distraction than as real isolation from all outside contact.³¹ Yet in general, hermits carried this withdrawal to solitude further than did monks, limiting their contact even with other

²⁸ Eucherius episcopus Lugdunensis, *De laude eremi*, PL 50, (3–4): 702; analyzed by Jean Leclercq in "La séparation du monde dans le monachisme au moyen âge," in *La séparation du monde* (Paris, 1961), p. 78. See Jean Leclercq, "'Eremus' et 'eremita.' Pour l'histoire du vocabulaire de la vie solitaire" *Collectanea ordinis Cisterciensium reformatorum* 25 (1963): 8–30, for an interesting analysis of the use of the word "eremus" in western Christian tradition. See also George H. Williams, *Wilderness and Paradise in Christian Thought* (New York, 1962) for a study of the psychological implications of wilderness theology.

²⁹ The ninth-century Hincmar tells of how, when one is quiet in spirit and flesh, it is possible to speak frequently with God and enjoy angelic vision. Hincmar of Rheims' letter to a group of recluses is in "Zwei Schriften des Erzbischofs Hinkmar von Reims," ed. Wilhelm Gundlach, *ZKG* 10 (1889): 267. Grimlaicus tells us that "Those who love this world are disturbed by its cares and worries," but that the person who leaves all that and takes up the solitary life begins while on earth to have "the rest of future peace." Grimlaicus, (prologus): 578; (5): 583. He also argues that, while all should obey the mandates of Christ, solitaries can do so better than the rest of Christian society, since they live secretly and remotely from others. Grimlaicus, (26): 609.

³⁰ An example is Maiolus of Cluny. See Jean Leclercq, "Saint Majolus and Cluny," in Leclercq, *Aspects of Monasticism* (Kalamazoo, 1978), pp. 214–15.

³¹ See the very interesting article by Nahmer on the foundation of Fulda and the meaning of the topos "solitude" in that case. Dieter von der Nahmer, "Die Klostergründung 'in solitudine'—ein unbrauchbarer hagiographischer Topos?" *Hessisches Jb für Landesgeschichte* 22 (1972): 90–111.

ascetics. The recluses reached a novel conclusion, however. They forbade contact with things of the world, *except* communication by voice with the people who came to them. Thus, recluses lived in a world in which both they and monks professed stability, but for very different purposes stretched over very different frameworks of belief.

As we have already seen, monks normally perceived the world as physically polluting. Recluses went further than did monks by eliminating physical contact even with other monks or nuns, except perhaps by a handclasp through the small window left in the cell for communication and delivery of food. But even this level of contact, by voice only, was possible only because the recluse had disconnected him or herself from the world by a life of vigorous asceticism.

It is hard to imagine the power and prestige of a recluse in the tenth or eleventh centuries. Most modern readers who are familiar with anchorites, or recluses, have an image of them very strongly influenced by late medieval practitioners such as the fourteenth-century Julian of Norwich. Julian stands out preeminently as a giver of spiritual advice, particularly thanks to the fame of her visions. Because of her reputation as a mystic, though, Julian was able to be an exception to what had become the societal norm. By that late period most recluses were indeed women, but few played a powerful social role.³² As new religious congregations came on the scene that were willing to take over the spiritual interaction with the laity that recluses had practiced, reclusion faded to a pale shadow of itself. The special attraction of asceticism was lost. As the thirteenth-century *Ancrene Riwe* makes clear, recluses lived in a fair amount of comfort, with fires in their cells in winter, a decent diet, and even servants.³³ The recluse of the tenth and eleventh centuries, on the other hand, was in general as ascetic as was humanly possible. The stories of reclusive life are grisly, showing the extremes that both recluses and the laity felt necessary to gain special grace with God. It is this question of how to gain such special grace that eventually led to a mingling of reclusive and monastic spirituality.

Reclusion was a life of rigid asceticism, unlike anything to be found in contemporary monasteries, although new groups in the eleventh

³² See Ann K. Warren, *Anchorites and Their Patrons in Medieval England* (Berkeley, 1985), passim.

³³ One of several good editions and translations of the *Ancrene Riwe* is *Ancrene Riwe*, trans. M.B. Salu (Exeter, 1990).

century, such as the Camaldolesi, attempted to emulate recluses' asceticism to a considerable degree.³⁴ The recluse attempted to subdue the flesh, rather than just avoid temptation. By their asceticism, recluses were the noted and approved martyrs of the ninth and first half of the tenth centuries. They were thus the heirs of a long tradition of equating asceticism and martyrdom. By the time of Origen and Cyprian, asceticism was already a way to be a martyr in times when the Church was not persecuted.³⁵ In the fourth century, the idea of "athlete of Christ" was transferred from martyrs to monks, and great ascetic feats were held up as a kind of martyrdom.³⁶ Sulpicius Severus describes Martin of Tours as a martyr, both because he was willing to die for Christ and because he had made his existence a living martyrdom through his life of self-torture.³⁷ Monasticism overall was considered from its early period as a kind of martyrdom; for example, Cassian described monks as "daily and living martyrs."³⁸ We have already seen that Rimbert depicted the missionary Ansgar of Corvey as a martyr because of his work as evangelist. For the rest of the ninth and much of the tenth centuries, though, writers did not describe monks in such terms, except in the exceptional cases of real or near martyrs. Meanwhile, ascetic martyrdom came to be associated above all with solitaries, both hermits and recluses. In the tenth century especially, when few opportunities for true martyrdom existed in western Europe, the solitary life was considered

³⁴ See Petrus Damiani, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, MGH Briefe, #161, especially 4: 135. This is a letter in praise of flagellation, apparently written to show the effectiveness of ascetic exercises.

³⁵ František Graus, *Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger: Studien zur Hagiographie der Merowingerzeit* (Prague, 1965), p. 101; for the importance of Origen in the transference of the attributes of martyrdom to the monk, see Edward E. Malone, *The Monk and the Martyr: The Monk as the Successor of the Martyr* (Washington, D.C., 1950), pp. 14–22.

³⁶ Malone, p. 72 and *passim*.

³⁷ Sulpicius Severus ep. 2 ad Aurelium, cited in Malone, p. 61. Asceticism was the "magnificent martyrdom" of peace-time, as Karl Frank describes it in *Grundzüge der Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums* (Darmstadt, 1975), p. 15. In the central middle ages both Ansgar and Gerald of Aurillac, although they died peacefully, were described as martyrs for their asceticism and efforts to serve God. Rimbertus, *Vita Anskarii*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol., (40): 74; Odo Cluniacensis, *The Life of St. Gerald of Aurillac*, in *St. Odo of Cluny*, ed. and trans. Gerard Sitwell (London, 1958), (II.preface): 133.

³⁸ John Cassian, *Conferences*, (XIX.8): 492. (SC 64, p. 46.) For analysis, see Joachim Wollasch, "Das Mönchgelübde als Opfer" *FMSI* 18 (1984): 530.

a valid ersatz martyrdom, and more solitaries were considered saints than were people from any other segment of society.³⁹

The fact that reclusion was a phenomenon closely associated with monasteries complicates the puzzle of why reclusive and monastic values were so different from each other before the eleventh century. Grimlaicus in his *Regula solitariorum* assumes that the recluses who follow his rule will be monks (he seems to have devised the treatise for male reclusion, and never mentions women as anything but temptresses).⁴⁰ This is very sensible, since recluses are of course totally dependent on others for supplying their daily needs. The support of a perpetual religious community would of course be far superior to reliance on friendly individuals to tend to food and other needs.⁴¹ Apparently reclusion was also seen as a logical progression from typical monastic life, one step to a "higher and greater rigor of life," as the account of the nun Caritas tells us.⁴² Monks vowed themselves to stability; it was easy to believe that recluses differed from them only in degree of strictness, not in type of life. Monks wanted to assimilate reclusion into the monastic life.

Still, although most recluses were associated in some way with monasteries or convents, few people seem to have thought of them as monks or nuns. This is eloquent testimony to a perceived difference in function. Monks prayed for society; recluses were special points of contact, liminal points between their clientele and God. Medieval

³⁹ Heinrich Fichtenau, *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1984) 2: 332–33. In this section, he is speaking specifically of hermits, but I believe his conclusions are even more applicable to recluses than to traditional hermits.

⁴⁰ Grimlaicus, (prologus): 575. He follows a long tradition of demanding wide experience from anyone entering a solitary form of religious life, which normally took the form of education in a monastery. See Grimlaicus, (19): 599; John Cassian, *The Institutes*, trans. Edgar Gibson (Grand Rapids, reprint ed. 1978), (VIII.18): 262; (SC 109, p. 358). Jerome, ep. 22,36,1; and RB 1.3–5. On Benedict of Nursia's attitude toward anchorites, see Adalbert de Vogüé, *Commentaire doctrinal et spirituel*, SC 186 (1977), pp. 95–97. Schmitz points out that recluses, strictly defined, flourished especially in Benedictine monasteries. See Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de saint-Benoît*, 2nd ed. (Maredsous, 1948–1956) 7: 56.

⁴¹ There is an interesting story in the *Chronicon Hugesburgense* of a monastery founded in the 1070's at the insistence of two recluses who were living in cells attached to a parish church. They wanted a rule to give direction to their piety and monks to instruct them, and essentially prevailed upon the canon who was living there and caring for them to establish the monastery of Huisburg by their cell. See *Chronicon Hugesburgense*, ed. Ottokar Menzel, *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 52 (1934): 140–42. For the history of this monastery, see Josef Semmler, *Die Klosterreform von Siegburg. Ihre Ausbreitung und ihr Reformprogramm im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1959), p. 65.

⁴² "altioris maiorisque vitae distractionem." *Vita Burchardi Wormatiensis*, (13): 838.

narrative sources usually refer to these solitaries simply as "*inclusus*" or "*reclusus*" (or the feminine forms of these words) without mentioning whether they are monks or nuns. It is frequently a matter of guesswork to identify whether a recluse was a professed religious or not. It was the fact of being a recluse that interested contemporaries, not any connection between the life of reclusion and monastic values. Thus it was possible for popular imagination to build up a mystique of the stable life that sidestepped much of the system carefully constructed by Benedict of Aniane and his successors. The popular view in turn led to a reassessment of the vow of stability by at least some monks themselves.

One must be careful when dealing with definitions for a poorly documented era. Recluses displaced monks as the martyrs of society. But with what sort of martyrdom are we dealing here? As the Irish would have put it, was it red martyrdom, the shedding of blood for the glory of God, as with Adalbert of Prague, or was it the white martyrdom of living a life that could be held up as a witness to Christian truth? And what is the purpose of such witness? Recluses in general appear to have lived in a pinkish area between the two forms. They abused their bodies with such severity that they were more effective as models for admiration than emulation. But such extremes as appear in accounts of recluses point to several clear purposes.

The sources generously attest to the ascetic side of reclusion. The forms that the recluses' asceticism took were above all measures specifically associated with stability. Normally the fact of solitude by itself was considered an ascetic practice. It was the discomforts of living confined to a small space that were emphasized or perhaps exaggerated in the case of recluses. Clearly the key to the typical recluse's ascetic fame, and thus much of his or her reputation for holiness, was the simple act of physical stability. Still, mentions of such austere practices as excessive fasting or the wearing of iron chains, common with hermits, are also frequent, especially in the hagiographical literature. When such ascetic practices do appear, they seem to have been in direct imitation of earlier eremitic models. For example when Romuald of Ravenna, as an old man at Sitria, remained for nearly seven years as a recluse, "and held continual silence inviolably," he was imitating Hilarion, an early Egyptian hermit.⁴³ It is not

⁴³ "et silentium continuum inviolabiliter tenuit." Petrus Damiani, *Vita beati Romualdi*,

by accident that I have included as an example one of the leaders of the move towards a more active monasticism in the world from the early eleventh century. Nor do I think it an accident that Peter Damian described Romuald as a recluse. Damian was associating two different sources of spiritual prowess in this period of confusion and transition in the religious community. He was both fully aware of the contemporary ideal of reclusion and familiar with the never-failing lure of return to the ancients. The silence of Romuald in reclusion adds a monastic element probably atypical for most recluses.

Hrotsvith of Gandersheim's fictional description of a recluse's cell draws a grotesquely vivid picture of confined life in that age before plumbing and electricity. In her play *Pafnutius*, written in the mid-tenth century, the ex-whore Thaïs was taken to a convent for penance. Pafnutius, the abbot responsible for her conversion, convinced her to allow herself to be shut up in a narrow, solitary cell, where she could repent her sins. At first Hrotsvith describes Thaïs as afraid to enter the cell that Pafnutius has prepared for her. It is very cramped and dark, she complains; she is certain she will not be able to live there. She is especially afraid of the smell that will develop if she has to perform her bodily functions in the same small place where she will be living. The timid penitent tries to convince the abbot that the whole thing is impossible, that she needs a calm and beautiful place to call upon God. The stern Pafnutius replies that Thaïs should fear the hardships of everlasting hell, not the transitory discomforts of this world and that her purpose there is penitence and humiliation; she should not even be so bold as to call upon God.⁴⁴ In the end, Thaïs accepts her penance and lives walled-up in her small cell for three years. She is then released and dies peacefully three days later. This description, ornamented as it is with a wealth of tenth-century rhetoric, is probably accurate in its basic outlines for most recluses before the twelfth century. The cells were certainly small, and there was usually careful regulation for only a small window, which cannot have let in much light. Clear references to more pleasant living

ed. Giovanni Tabacco (Rome, 1957), (52): 94; discussed in Giovanni Tabacco, "Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell'eremitismo Camaldolese," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, p. 80. Grimlaicus suggests moderation in all things. For instance, on the subject of fasting he suggests daily austerity, rather than long periods of abstinence and is content with prohibiting meat or fowl to the recluse, except in cases of grave illness. Grimlaicus, (54): 645, (43): 634.

⁴⁴ Hrotsvith, *Pafnutius*, in *Hrotsvithae opera*, pp. 343-44.

conditions, such as recluses having small gardens attached to their cells, or the inmates being given an allowance of firewood in the winter, all stem from a later period when reclusion had become watered-down in a very different religious atmosphere.⁴⁵

Part of the mystique of reclusion is its penitential side. Early liturgical books mention penitential reclusion as a temporary state used as a stage in the process of penance.⁴⁶ This practice was carried on as a permanent state by men and women vowed to reclusion. To the author of the *vita* of St. Findan, the recluse's cell was the *poenalem locum*, "the place of punishment or penance."⁴⁷ Other accounts tell of recluses weeping for their sins, following the early hermit Macarius' advice to monks to flee from the rest of humanity and sit in their cells and weep for their sins.⁴⁸ Thietmar of Merseburg tells of a female recluse named Sisu (d. 1018), who lived in Drübeck in Westphalia and spent sixty-four years as a solitary. During that time, "she studied to keep herself more pure than human frailty permits," decorating her cell with her prayers and tears.⁴⁹ Grimlaicus also reminds his readers that the recluse should never be complacent about his spiritual stature, but should remain humble and penitent, repeating and emphasizing the general belief that human life is uncertain and no one knows if he or she will be saved or damned.⁵⁰

The center-piece of a recluse's life, however, remained the ideal of stability in one place until death. The recluse's cell was likened to a prison. Indeed, the use of "prison" vocabulary to describe the monastic life was first applied to solitaries.⁵¹ Grimlaicus also equates

⁴⁵ See *The Ancrene Riwele*, passim; Aelred of Rievaulx, *La Vie de Recluse*, ed. Charles Dumont, SC 76 (1961), passim.

⁴⁶ Cyrille Vogel, "Les rites de la pénitence publique aux X^e et XI^e siècles," in *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet*, ed. Pierre Gallais and Yves-Jean Riou (Poitiers, 1966) 1: 141.

⁴⁷ *Vita Findani*, (9): 506. Similarly, Hincmar of Rheims in a letter to a group of recluses refers to their cell as a "place of penance." He has an ulterior motive for stressing the penitential, withdrawn side of reclusion, as he goes on to urge them strongly to maintain their humility and simplicity, and not to get involved in the theological controversy of Gottschalk of Saxony that was raging at the time. Hincmar, "Zwei Schriften," pp. 262-63.

⁴⁸ *Sayings*, (Macarius the Great. 27): 133.

⁴⁹ "ac immaculatam se plus, quam fragilitas humana permisit, custodire studuit." Thietmar Merseburgensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 9, (VIII.8): 502.

⁵⁰ Grimlaicus, (24): 606, (69): 663-664.

⁵¹ Jean Leclercq, "Le cloître est-il une prison?" *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 47 (1971): 412. He cites several early examples of this terminology, including a seventh-

reclusion and imprisonment in one section of his rule.⁵² It is natural that such a comparison should be made. Recluses gave up the freedom to leave their cells, and the vow must have seemed very burdensome at times. In at least one case, reclusion seems to have been a self-imposed punishment for a tendency to wander. The *Casus s. Galli* tells of a rebellious monk named Victor, who left the monastery to escape a savagely disciplinarian abbot. He returned to St. Gall after a bishop patched up their dispute, but soon after, when outside of the monastery visiting friends (with permission), he was waylaid and blinded by the abbot's order. After this, he became a recluse, and, we are told, lived a holy life for many years until his death.⁵³ Here again, it becomes possible to see the closeness of recluses to the reformed monks of the tenth century. The monks were less ascetic, but were vowed to a weaker form of reclusive stability. There are also signs in the tenth-century literature that the normal monks (not abbots) who received the most praise were those who rarely or never left the cloister.⁵⁴

The great dividing line between recluses and monks, and the original basis for the recluses' spiritual authority, was the level of withdrawal from the world and the interpretation each group gave it. The awe-struck admiration with which extant sources describe this immovability suggests that a desire to obey canon law was not the central concern of either recluses or admirers. I have not found canons of any synod after 794 that regulate reclusion.⁵⁵ By then the apparatus for the practice was fully in place; the full asceticism of reclusion and its veneration could grow upon that foundation.

century account of St. Fructuosus that describes him living as a recluse in an *ergastulum*—a detention cell.

⁵² Grimlaicus, (14): 592.

⁵³ *Casus s. Galli*, (9): 116–17.

⁵⁴ Thus, for example, the author of part of the *Casus s. Galli* praises the monk Ratpertus for going out so little that he rarely wore out his shoes. *Casus s. Galli*, (3): 95. Abbo of Fleury was murdered in a monastic revolt precipitated by his forbidding a monk to leave the monastic enclave. Aimo, *Vita s. Abbonis*, PL 139, (20): 410. In this case, it is clear that the issue was not just one of stability, but also of obedience—i.e., a good reforming abbot expected his monks to stay at home unless they had special permission.

⁵⁵ Canon 12 of the Frankfurt synod of 794 says nothing that had not been legislated for recluses many times already: that recluses must have the permission of the local bishop before enclosure, and also that of their abbot, in this case showing clearly the assumption that the normal recluse would come from the ranks of the monks. Earlier synods also often included a trial period. MGH Conc. 2.1, (c. 12): 168.

Even praiseworthy reasons for leaving the cell were not allowed, and the stubborn persistence of recluses became the food for miracle tales. For example, there is a curious story in the *vita* of the Irish Findan, a recluse at Rheinau who died in 878. Findan heard that the relics of the martyr St. Blaise had been translated to a church in the area. He was filled with a desire to see them, but leaving his cell was impossible. God had pity on his predicament by sending a dove to the saintly recluse, carrying the relics to him.⁵⁶ The permanence of reclusion was even carried to the point of burying dead recluses in their own cells, often in the graves they themselves had prepared.⁵⁷

Undertaking to remain enclosed no matter what the provocation led to extremes in which recluses refused to leave their cells even to save their lives. The most famous case is that of St. Wiborada. She prophesied the coming of Hungarian raiders and urged the monks and people of St. Gall to escape to safety, but refused to go herself. Her hagiographer Hartmannus gives us a moving account of how first a group of monks and then the abbot himself begged her to flee with them. But her reply was: "If, as I hope and believe, my Lord is my helper, that which is fixed in my soul can never be changed. I shall not leave empty this little house, granted to me by God's mercy, while my body is living." Wiborada was indeed killed by the barbarians, angry because the valuables of the monastery had been removed to safety and suspicious of her presence there.⁵⁸

The recluse Paternus in the city of Paderborn was widely famed for a similar reason. He prophesied that, unless the people repented

⁵⁶ *Vita Findani*, (7): 505.

⁵⁷ *Vita s. Hugonis monachi Aeduensi et priore Enziacensi*, AASS Apr. II, (III.17): 766; Hartmannus, (IV.38): 297; Eberwinus, (19): 90. Marianus Scottus occupied the former cell of Animchadus and tells that he sang mass daily standing above the place where his predecessor was buried. He also saw a vision of Animchadus, and reports a wonderful odor that came from the tomb on one occasion. Marianus Scottus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1043], p. 557.

⁵⁸ "Si Dominus mihi, ut spero et credo, adiutor est, quod semel animo fixum est mutari non potest: istam mansiunculam, Dei clementia mihi concessam, vivens in corpore vacuum non relinquam." Hartmannus, (III.26): 294–95; *Casus s. Galli*, (3): 107; Herimannus Augiensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 5 [a. 925], p. 113. It is very interesting to compare this account of Hartmannus' to Gregory of Tours' tale of the saintly recluse Hospicius. The two stories have so many similarities that Hartmannus must have been familiar with Gregory's work: even the detail of two enemy soldiers breaking a hole in the roof of the cell to get to the recluse is the same. But Hospicius knows by divine inspiration that he will not be killed, so his refusal to leave does not carry nearly the dramatic force and affirmation of reclusion that the account of Wiborada does. Gregory of Tours, *History*, (VI.6): 333–34.

and did penance for their evil ways, the city would be burned within thirty days. The people did not repent. Paternus arranged to have the treasury of the monastery where he lived moved to a safe place, but refused to leave himself. As a result, he was burned in the fire he had foretold. Perhaps the greatest moral of this story is that he, just like Wiborada, was hailed as a martyr for his stubbornness. Marianus Scottus tells of visiting and praying in the cell Paternus had inhabited and explains that the recluse, "desiring martyrdom, would not go out [of his cell] for anything, but having been burned in his little cell he passed through fire into a place of refreshment."⁵⁹

The monks did not, however, place an emphasis on great physical hardship, as did the recluses. The recluse Sisú, mentioned above, must have been in wretched health. Thietmar tells admiringly: "She did not throw off the worms that were continually eating her, but put back upon herself those that fell, like the monk Simeon standing long ago upon his pillar." He adds that she often almost froze in the winter.⁶⁰ Findan and Liutbirga both suffered great physical distress through their ascetic practices and the smallness of the space in which they were confined.⁶¹ Other recluses suffered from a variety of illnesses. Salome, an Anglo-Saxon princess who became a recluse at Niederaltaich, suffered from leprosy even before becoming a recluse (she contracted it after praying to lose her beauty to save her virginity).⁶² Rachild, who became a recluse at the St. Gall church of St. Mängen in 920, was plagued with illness, to the extent that the author of that part of the *Casus s. Galli* says that her life was like a martyrdom and compares her to Job. Besides suffering from breast cancer, she endured a long illness during which she could neither eat nor drink, except for the Eucharist. Rachild's predecessor, St. Widorada, visited her in a vision that led to Rachild's recovery, but doubtless

⁵⁹ "ambiens martirium pro nullo foris exivit, sed in sua clausola combustus per ignem pertransivit in refrigerium." Marianus Scottus [a. 1058], p. 558. William of Malmesbury also tells how a recluse of Nantes was killed when that town was burned by troops of William the Conqueror. See William of Malmesbury, *Gesta reg. Angliae* II, p. 336; III, p. 292, cited in Gougaud, p. 109. It is more pleasant to note that there is a later story of a recluse who was miraculously *not* burned in a fire. *Vita Drogonis*, AASS Apr. II: 443-45.

⁶⁰ "Vermes se iugiter comedentes non abiecit, sed cadentes reposuit, vice monachi Symeonis in columnā diu stantis." Thietmar, (VIII.8): 502-504. See also Bernhard Schelb, "Inklusen am Oberrhein" *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* Neue Folge 41 (68) (1941): 198.

⁶¹ *Vita Findani*, (7): 504-506; Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis*, p. 17 on Liutbirga.

⁶² *Vita bb. Salomes et Judith*, AASS Iun. VII, (2): 454-55.

most recluses were not so fortunate.⁶³ The most chilling view of the health of a recluse, because her hagiographer takes it so much for granted, is given by Hartmannus in his account of Wiborada. To show his heroine's sanctity, Hartmannus tells how Wiborada's corpse became beautiful after her martyrdom: the wounds she had suffered at the hands of the Magyar marauders who had murdered her closed on their own. Besides that, he relates how her misused and frostbitten feet regained their original form and only an arm and a leg, which had shriveled while she was alive, remained crooked. When they prepared her corpse for burial, they also found the marks of an iron chain she had worn wrapped around her body. Her life must indeed have been a form of martyrdom.⁶⁴ But Grimlaicus, assuming that many or most recluses would be monks, at least tells his male recluses that they ought to bathe, especially those who are priests and must be clean to celebrate mass.⁶⁵

Yet another ascetic fact of enclosure is that it meant a separation from friends and relatives much more absolute than that expected of those entering monasteries. Many recluses were also enclosed at considerable distances from their homes. Substantial numbers of Irish monks came to the Continent and became recluses, carrying their separation from their home society to the greatest possible extreme. Others besides the Irish went to distant areas, even crossing the borders of language and religious custom. The recluse Simeon, who had lived in the East most of his life, came from Syria to the Rhineland city of Trier to take up the reclusive life.⁶⁶ This move to a life of total dependency upon strangers in a strange and new environment must have called for considerable courage and faith, and must be reckoned as not least among the ascetic aspects of reclusion.⁶⁷ Thus

⁶³ *Casus s. Galli*, (10): 119; Hartmannus, (IV.34) 296 for her miraculous recovery.

⁶⁴ Hartmannus, (III.31): 295.

⁶⁵ Grimlaicus, (51): 642-43.

⁶⁶ It is possible that some of the initial impetus for the increasing numbers of recluses on the Continent came from the Irish, especially from the values of the Céli Dé movement in their homeland that put a new emphasis on stability, rather than *peregrinatio*. For Simeon's wanderings, see Eberwinus, (10-14): 88-89.

⁶⁷ In Simeon's case there was very real danger. The people of Trier, probably disturbed by unfamiliar religious rites, accused the recluse of necromancy and tried to stone him. Eberwinus, (16): 90. See Jack A. Vernon, *Inside the Black Room* (New York, 1963), especially pp. 176-78 for a very interesting study of sensory deprivation, which is similar in many ways to the life led by recluses in our period. Vernon found that those of his subjects who came from a distance to participate in the study and did not know the experimenters or the environment found it much more

ascetic punishment plays some role in the life and sanctification of a recluse, but almost always the fact of physical restriction dominates in accounts of reclusion.⁶⁸

iii. *The recluse as caregiver*

But what do these monks and nuns following a life of extreme deprivation have to do with the flowering of religious life in a multitude of new forms in the eleventh century? The heart of their connection lies in the similarity of function. A recluse gave up all physical contact with other humans. Shut up permanently in a cell, he or she could not touch and could rarely see other people. Yet still people surrounded recluses. They did not lose communication with others; instead, large numbers came to recluses for advice and spiritual counsel. Thus recluses reduced the danger of physical sin, but increased the risk of distraction. Escape from the distractions of secular life is much easier for a hermit to achieve than a recluse—a hermit can get up and go to a more remote area if he is troubled too much by visitors, as frequently occurred.⁶⁹ A recluse, on the other hand, was restricted to one place for better or worse. As we will see, in many cases crowds of visitors frequented recluses' cells, often coming from considerable distances, to seek aid and advice.

The reclusive life as it had evolved by the tenth century was a meeting of several elements of ascetic belief and practice. It mingled institutional asceticism with concern for personal salvation. At the same time growing out of this was the search for a new balance between the active and contemplative lives while remaining safe in a

difficult to cope with sensory deprivation than those who were more familiar with the area and people involved.

⁶⁸ I cannot agree with Warren's view that there was an emphasis on punishment as opposed to a glorification of the rewards of reclusive life, which she outlines in Warren, p. 94. There is some evidence for the glorifying view of reclusion, above all in Grimlaicus and the frequent mentions of solitaires as "recluse for the love of God." There are three recluses described in this way in the St. Gall necrology alone. But in general, neither theme is really dominant, giving pride of place to the pastoral care function of the recluse.

⁶⁹ For example, Meinrad (d. 861) twice fled further from inhabited lands to escape his popularity. *Vita s. Meginradi*, MGH 15,1, (5–6): 446. A hermit (called a recluse in the *vita*, but obviously mobile) to whom St. Simeon of Trier (d. 1035) went for education in the religious life, also went off to a more isolated area. Eberwinus, (4): 87.

society that interpreted the dangers of the world rather differently than did monks. It was in reclusion that the tension between the needs of the individual and the community really became apparent. The needs both of the recluse and the society around his or her cell were met: the recluse found holiness in withdrawal from society and at the same time gave society access to that holiness through the small window looking out onto the world. The great individualism of the eremitical life and the communal structures of the monastery met in reclusion, which developed as it did in response to the pressures of these two ideals, both of which had great authority and appeal.

One can see that recluses were searching for individuality that expressed itself in a New Testament-defined care for others. In that facet of their lives they went further and were well ahead of the New Testament-style, evangelical monks of this study. The search for individuality led in the case of recluses to a desire to convert others. Many recluses were notable spiritual advisors and attracted many laymen and clergy who came to them for a variety of religious purposes. It was recluses, not monks, who first followed in the footsteps of the holy men of Late Antiquity, teaching, settling disputes, and providing a more personal bridge between God and those who came to them. One must note that this was a function divorced from rank in secular society. A common monk, even a woman, who became a recluse was expected to play an active spiritual and often social role, while among tenth-century monks only the high-ranking abbots were usually visible. The religious beliefs and practices of recluses were very individual; they worked, often by extreme means, to open a line of communication to God, such as was rarely achieved in the communal institution that Benedictine monasticism had become.

Another side of this spiritual struggle also caught the popular imagination. The recluse, along with the hermit, was expected to be a warrior for Christ.⁷⁰ While this was sometimes understood simply as asceticism, as controlling the body against possible temptation, it was also frequently seen as an active warfare against the forces of evil.⁷¹ Authors describe recluses as tempted or simply attacked by

⁷⁰ See *Grimlaicus*, (4): 582, (23): 604.

⁷¹ *Leclercq*, "Eremus," p. 26 describes the eremitical life as single combat against the devil.

demons. Eberwinus, the hagiographer of St. Simeon of Trier, tells how demons in the form of vultures, eagles, and other monstrous shapes tried to get at the recluse through the windows of his cell. The devil himself, disguised as a beggar, tried to tempt Wiborada, looking through the little window in her cell that communicated with the outside world.⁷² As late as the twelfth century, Peter the Venerable warned the recluse Gilbert of the danger inherent in being a recluse. It is, he says, hazardous to fight the devil and temptation alone; a recluse chooses the most narrow possible way, and it is all too easy to fall.⁷³ But the recluse was rarely totally alone; indeed, it is surprising to discover that the companionship involved in the reclusive life was held up as one of its great advantages over traditional eremitism.

A tantalizing piece of evidence exists that at least one influential churchman of the mid-tenth century saw the spiritual advantages of reclusion and the ways they could be applied to the greater good of society. Archbishop Bruno of Cologne's hagiographer Ruotger tells how his hero gathered up the hermits in his archdiocese and forced them to become recluses.⁷⁴ This ambiguous tale does not explain Bruno's reasons behind such an act, so we must look to what we know of his life to interpret the passage. Bruno was Otto I's brother, and both archbishop and duke of Lotharingia. As such, he was very likely to have resented unauthorized and uncontrolled preaching and teaching within his borders. However, he did not simply throw these hermits into monasteries, to be lost in the discipline of Rule and custom. He recognized their superior religious standing, probably in most cases as professed monks who had moved from monastery to hermitage. His ingathering made them more available to the people in a more controllable fashion, one that added the virtue of stability to the ascetic life of a hermit. That his purpose was not just control but the provision of spiritual experts for his flock is suggested both by the fact that these hermits were not simply put in monasteries, and that Bruno had close affinities with the practices of

⁷² Eberwinus, (16): 90; Hartmannus, (II.21): 293. One should note that the demons in both cases stayed outside of the cell. Apparently the recluse was considered on safe territory as long as he or she kept to the vow of stability.

⁷³ Petrus Venerabilis, ep. 20, in *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*, ed. Giles Constable (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 1: 31.

⁷⁴ Ruotger, *Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis*, MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 10, (33): 34.

the Gorzian reform. This movement has acquired a reputation in recent scholarship as more "pro-world" than other tenth-century reforming groups.⁷⁵ Gorze and its daughter houses provided many of the monk-missionaries discussed in chapter two. Hints also exist that Gorzian houses at least occasionally played a role in the Christian education of the laity. One possible example of this phenomenon is the odd fact that it is Gorzian customaries that provide the first mention of the Easter play at the sepulcher, from a time before 970.⁷⁶ As usual we have no evidence whether this short play was intended for a lay or monastic audience. It seems quite likely that at least some of the laity were spectators, because traces in extant Gorzian writing also show them as among the earliest to justify activity such as mission in biblical as well as monastic terms.⁷⁷

Not surprisingly, the would-be monks who founded Gorze did not have monastic experience. Instead they were hermits, semi-recluses, even members of the secular clergy. This could well account for their "pro-world" attitude. Like all monks, their life contained elements in common with that of recluses and hermits. They were noted for their stability and wholesome way of life, but were not bound to the full rigor of reclusive stability.

Reclusion must have been chosen, especially by the tenth century when it had become more common, with a full knowledge of the role the recluses would probably be called upon to play. Indeed, we hear very few complaints against the interaction of recluses with people who came to them for advice and aid. Most of the references to flight from the world in the sources are in Grimlaicus, when he is quoting verbatim the sayings of the Desert Fathers, which did not necessarily reflect the beliefs current in his time.⁷⁸ The eremitical and reclusive lives were two very different paths for avoiding temptation, an avoidance that ascetics assumed to be the main purpose of

⁷⁵ Lotter, *Die vita Brunonis*, makes a good argument that Gorze was considerably more friendly to the laity than were most monasteries of the time, and that this is reflected in Ruotger's *vita* since Ruotger was almost certainly a monk of St. Pantaleon, a house that followed Gorzian customs. See especially pp. 17, 37.

⁷⁶ C.H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism* (London, 1984), p. 91.

⁷⁷ See Phyllis G. Jestice, "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel," *Viator* 24 (1993): 51-78.

⁷⁸ See Leclercq, "L'érémisme," pp. 31-33; Leclercq, "Pierre le Vénérable et l'érémisme clunisien," in *Petrus Venerabilis*, ed. Giles Constable and James Kritzeck, *StAns* 40 (Rome 1956), pp. 102, 110; Etienne Delaruelle, "Les ermites et la spiritualité populaire," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, p. 213.

their asceticism. Hermits, like monks, fled from contact with threatening influences. Recluses were cut off from physical contact; therefore in popular estimation they were superlative avoiders of sin and must be particularly close to God.⁷⁹ Recluses were set aside from the world physically, so they could in turn teach others and be considered in a special position of holiness. Because of their quality as outsiders from the world's normal functions, our authors thought that recluses were able to avoid most temptation better than others could; they were holy men and women of a very superior sort. There is no sign of defensiveness, or of apologists emphasizing that intention was the most important point upon which to look in any religious vocation. Since recluses were so obviously stable, defending their holiness was not necessary. Therefore recluses could lead very active lives, teaching and exhorting others without ever provoking the insults directed at wandering monks who were performing basically the same functions. Recluses had enough confidence in their special position of holiness that they felt they could interact, albeit under carefully controlled conditions, with people seeking their help. Individuals were dealing with individuals, unlike the impersonal nature of other ascetic organizations.

The institution of reclusion appealed greatly to considerable numbers of laypeople and churchmen. Recluses are frequently mentioned in the extant *vitae* as well as chronicles, annals, and necrologies (books kept by a monastery to commemorate the dead, and remind the monks of who died when), almost always in terms of the highest veneration and usually surrounded by crowds of people who came to them for advice. There is also the simple fact that recluses depended almost completely on the good will of those among whom they lived: these people supported the recluses, usually with gifts far greater than their needs required.⁸⁰ One recent study describes the recluse as a "martyr, viator, penitent, mystic, *miles Christi* [soldier of Christ]" for the people of an area.⁸¹ While all this is certainly true, we often see the recluse in a much more humble light. Few recluses were called to literal martyrdom, although their society highly venerated those

⁷⁹ See Grimlaicus, (5-6): 583, (14): 591-92.

⁸⁰ Rimburtus, (35): 69 on how Ansgar visited and subsidized recluses; *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, ed. Karl Strecker, MGH Epist. Selectae 3, #56, pp. 65-66 tells of the regular supply service to a recluse associated with the monastery of Tegernsee. The examples could easily be multiplied.

⁸¹ Warren, p. 7.

who were. And although the martyrs were held up as marvels of asceticism, they inspired relatively few to imitate them. Much of recluses' time seems to have been spent in counseling their lay neighbors and in running a relief service for the poor and infirm. Recluses thus undertook many functions that monks did only through intermediaries, actions that involved frequent contact with lay society.

An important part of the recluse's life was care of the poor, as many references in the extant literature attest, and this aspect of their lives seems to have remained constant over time.⁸² Liutbirga, her hagiographer tells, daily helped paupers, consoled widows and orphans, and applied herself to the care of the sick. She carried this to the point of sending gifts to the needy outside of her area when she heard of them.⁸³ Although both rule and popular opinion expected recluses to be poor, they received many gifts, and thus acted as the intermediaries for distribution of alms.⁸⁴ Hagiographers also tell of miracles of generosity, as when a large number of paupers came to the recluse St. Findan on St. Brigit's day. He fed the multitude with what food he had, which was miraculously multiplied like the loaves and fishes (Mt 15.36–37) so that it could satisfy the entire crowd.⁸⁵

Recluses were also teachers. Grimlaicus exhorts recluses not to have too many disciples, but assumes that they will attract some, whom they should educate in the godly life.⁸⁶ Frequently a recluse also attracted one or two disciples who later became recluses themselves.⁸⁷ And, although Grimlaicus speaks against it, there is also at least one case of a recluse running a general school. Liutbirga was so famous as a teacher that the distant archbishop Ansgar of Bremen sent girls to her for education. She taught them not only psalms and religious living but also fine handiwork. She herself was famous as an artist, and perhaps these students also learned that skill from the holy rec-

⁸² For a discussion of this role in the twelfth century, see H. Mayr-Harting, "Functions of a Twelfth-Century Recluse" *History* 60 (1975): 337–52.

⁸³ *Vita Liutbirgae*, (36): 45.

⁸⁴ See Grimlaicus, (41): 631–32. We are told that many brought Wiborada gifts as her fame grew, which she in turn gave to the poor and guests. Hartmannus, (II.14): 291.

⁸⁵ *Vita Findani*, (11): 506.

⁸⁶ Grimlaicus, (52–53): 644.

⁸⁷ Rachild joined Wiborada at St. Gall; see Hartmannus, (III.22): 294. Judith followed her relative Salome's example in becoming a recluse; *Vita Salomes et Judith*, (3): 455.

luse.⁸⁸ It does not appear, however, that recluses were valued particularly for their erudition. Grimlaicus says that the solitary should be well-educated, but there are few references to the studies of recluses until the very end of the central middle ages (c. 1100).⁸⁹ Hartker of St. Gall, who died in 1011 or 1017, composed an antiphonary, but he was clearly an exception.⁹⁰ Other recluses involved in intellectual pursuits do not appear until late.⁹¹ In general, their teaching was moral and spiritual, rather than scholarly.

In a tenth-century reformed monastery, stability played a very important role—to keep the monks clean in heart and mind so they could pray more effectively. Oddly enough, there are few references to recluses as providers of prayer, even though all sectors of society believed in the special efficacy of prayer by an ascetic elite. Although prayer for others must have been one of their functions, it plays a very small part in the extant sources. This sets them off clearly from their monastic milieu, since monks were supported above all by payments from the laity in return for prayer. Surprisingly, references to the prayer-duties of recluses appear only in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, and then are rare. Peter the Venerable's famous letter to the recluse Gilbert, the most-copied of all of Peter's letters, concludes by requesting Gilbert's prayers for Peter himself and for all the Cluniac brethren.⁹² Another example shows the more grasping, or at least more pragmatic side, of recluses' need for alms from well-wishers. This is the letter of a recluse, only identified as "G.," to King Vratislav II of Bohemia, written in 1090 or 1091 and

⁸⁸ *Vita Liutbirgae*, (35): 44. See also Grosse, p. 59. For Grimlaicus' statement against operating general schools, see (52): 644.

⁸⁹ See Grimlaicus, (20): 599.

⁹⁰ Mentioned by Gougaud, p. 77.

⁹¹ The woman recluse Diemut (fl. 1080–c. 1130) in the monastery of Wessobrunn was famous as a copyist and a large number of her manuscripts are still extant. See MGH *Necrologiae*, 1: 45; Rotraut Schnitzer, *Die Vita B. Herlucae Pauls von Bernried. Eine Quelle zur gregorianischen Reform in Süddeutschland* (Bamberg, 1967), pp. 49–50. A Regensburg recluse named Adalbert wrote a *vita* of Ulrich of Cluny, no longer extant, in c. 1100; mentioned in MGH SS 12: 253; see Marinus Maier, "Ein Schwäbisch-Bayerischer Freundeskreis Gregor VII. nach der *Vita Herlucae* des Paul v. Bernried" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 74 (1963): 329. Semmler has suggested that the theologian Honorius Augustodunensis was a recluse; Josef Semmler, *Die Klosterreform*, p. 272. The chronicler Marianus Scottus (d. c. 1082) was a recluse and gives much interesting information about the solitary life in the pages of his history. Marianus Scottus, pp. 481–568.

⁹² *Petrus Venerabilis*, #20, p. 41. On the popularity of this work and its context in Cluniac history, see Leclercq, "Pierre le Vénérable," pp. 112–19.

strongly hinting at his need for charity. The recluse tells the king that, even though Vratislav did not send G. any "sign of his love" (i.e., gifts) when his son died, he is still continuing his daily prayers for the well-being of the royal family.⁹³

The most common activity mentioned in the sources is that of giving advice to visitors. Often this may have been private confession, which did not require priestly ordination in this period.⁹⁴ Interestingly, in this period there is evidence that the pious sought recluses of both sexes for their counsel. No distinction whatever appears to have been made between male and female recluses in this regard; not only peasants, but nobles and even bishops frequently went to women recluses for spiritual advice.⁹⁵

The sources rarely tell us the content of the advice given by recluses. Sometimes the question was whether or not the person seeking advice should enter the religious life or should change to a different kind of religious profession: this was recorded in the case of John of Gorze and the future bishop Ulrich of Augsburg, and later with John Gualbert, the founder of Vallombrosa.⁹⁶ The other cases in which a recluse's advice is described are usually incidents in which the author is trying to display the superior holiness of a situation. It seems clear that the recluse is there used as a "model of holiness," the mere mention of whom would force the hearers to recognize the validity behind claims of heavenly inspiration. An early example is the advice given to the British abbot of Bangor before his first meeting

⁹³ *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV.*, ed. Carl Erdmann and Norbert Fickermann, MGH Briefe 5, #9, p. 398.

⁹⁴ Grimlaicus specifically mentions the possibility of women coming for either confession or counsel. Grimlaicus, (16): 594.

⁹⁵ Liutbirga both gave and received advice from many notables, including Archbishop Ansgar. See *Vita Liutbirgae*, (35): 43–44. See also *Chronicon Hujesburgense*, p. 139, and Hartmannus, (II.17): 292 for other examples of women recluses advising important men. Hartmannus notes that Wiborada led not only women, but also men to serving God through her advice and example. See (I.1): 289.

⁹⁶ Iohannes s. Arnulfi, (21): 343; see also Leclercq, "Jean de Gorze," pp. 135–36. The story is told of Ulrich that, while studying at the monastic school at St. Gall, the monks tried to convince him to make his profession. He went to Wiborada for advice; she prayed for three days, then told the young Ulrich that he could not become a monk because he was destined to become a bishop in the east. Hartmannus, (II.17): 292; Gerhardus, *Vita sancti Oudalrici episcopi*, MGH SS 4, (1): 386; Ulrich's special religious education from Wiborada is described in *Casus s. Galli*, (3): 107. Irlich points out that, as it stands, the story of Wiborada's advice to Ulrich is chronologically impossible, but that the incident may well have occurred later in Ulrich's life. Irlich, p. 131. For John Gualbert, see Andreas Strumensi, *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*, MGH SS 30,2, (8): 1081.

with Augustine of Canterbury; a recluse told the abbot to accept Augustine if he behaved in a humble manner. Augustine's failure to do so led to the rejection of his mission by the native British church, the members of which followed the recluse's advice and refused to accept innovators from Rome.⁹⁷ Recluses also verified relics. When Stephen of Hungary was canonized in 1083, moving his body was impossible, according to the *vita*, until the recluse Karitas (not to be confused with the recluse mentioned above whom Bishop Burchard consecrated) was consulted and had ordained a three-day fast to win the saint's acceptance of the transfer.⁹⁸ In considerably less savory circumstances, the monastery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg boldly claimed in the year 1049 to have "discovered" the body of St. Dionysius the Areopagite. To lend verity to this totally unsupported assertion, the *translatio* written in 1049 claimed that a recluse had made known the whereabouts of the relics to Abbot Richolfus of St. Emmeram's.⁹⁹

In general, the sources go no further than to say that recluses gave spiritual advice. They certainly formed spiritual ties with people in the area.¹⁰⁰ Above all, they seem to have exhorted their visitors to pursue a better life, both by word and by example. The most complete description is once again found in Grimlaicus' *Regula solitariorum*. He explains that a recluse should be learned so he can teach his neighbors, "so he might be able to irrigate [them] with the flowing streams of doctrine." He goes on to suggest that a recluse ought to be able to refute Jews or heretics and to turn people from worldly

⁹⁷ Bede describes the counsellor as "a holy and prudent man, who was leading the life of an anchorite near them . . ." (*quendam uirum sanctum ac prudentem, qui apud eos anachoreticam ducere uitam solebat*). Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, in *Baedae Opera Historica*, ed. Carolus Plummer (Oxford, 1896), (II.2): 82.

⁹⁸ *Vita maior Stephani*, MGH SS 11, (20): 240.

⁹⁹ *Translationis et inventionis sancti Dionysii Ratisponensis historia antiquior*, MGH SS 30,2, (5): 828; for analysis, see Bernhard Bischoff, "Literarisches und künstlerisches Leben in St. Emmeram (Regensburg) während des frühen und hohen Mittelalters" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 51 (1933): 128-34.

¹⁰⁰ Judith, an English recluse at Niederaltaich in the latter ninth century, adopted a monk of that community as a son because of his spiritual gifts. She died c. 880, and her *vita* with that of her fellow recluse Salome was written by a roughly contemporary monk of Niederaltaich. *Vita Salomes et Judith*, (3): 456. Liutbirga even agreed to become a godmother (one suspects that this was not an isolated incident, even though a series of Church councils had proclaimed that monks and nuns should not act as godparents). This case ended unhappily, though, since the child, conceived in sin on a Sunday as the *vita* tells us, died on the day planned for its baptism. *Vita Liutbirgae*, (31-33): 37-39.

vices to the service of God.¹⁰¹ I have only found one example of a recluse giving bad advice. The earliest *vita* of St. Wenceslas mentions a recluse who lived in Prague during the reign of Boleslas I of Bohemia. This recluse was esteemed as a holy man, but, says the hagiographer, gave evil counsel.¹⁰² Typically, though, people did not question the advice of recluses, and recluses were admonished to be models to others. The pages of Grimlaicus' rule are full of exhortations to act in a way that shows love toward neighbor, and to be an example that will lead others to a good life.¹⁰³ As Grimlaicus acknowledges, preaching is different for solitaries than it is for bishops and priests. The latter are commissioned to preach to many. Recluses, though, are not commissioned at all, but for the sake of *caritas* alone (*sed pro sola charitate*) they privately and secretly spread God's word with their exhortations.¹⁰⁴

iv. *The holiness of recluses*

Clearly, many people came for counsel to the cells in which recluses were enclosed. These holy prisoners had great fame at least locally, while some attained recognition by the entire Western Church. The first woman formally canonized by a pope was the recluse Wiborada (in the year 1047), after she had already enjoyed a popular cult for over a century.¹⁰⁵ Anno of Cologne held up the example of Simeon

¹⁰¹ "Deinde ut advenientium quorundam corda arentia proximorum, fluentis rivis doctrinae valeat irrigare." Grimlaicus, (20): 600–601; (25): 608; (68): 661. The only example that I can find from before the mid-eleventh century of disapproval of the teaching function of recluses is in a letter of Hincmar of Rheims giving advice to some recluses. He tells them forcefully that reclusion is a place of penitence. Penitents cannot even teach themselves; they will be destroyed if they try to teach others. Hincmar, "Zwei Schriften," p. 263. The main purpose of this letter, however, was to speak against the heresy of Gottschalk. It seems clear from its tone and the archbishop's exhortations for the recluses to remain uninvolved in the controversy, that the recipients of the letter had taken Gottschalk's side in the matter, and Hincmar was trying to stop them. The same theme appears in the writings of Peter Damian, examined below.

¹⁰² *Vita et Passio sancti Wenceslai et sancte Ludmille avie eius*, in Josef Pekař, *Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians* (Prag, 1906), (10): 124.

¹⁰³ Grimlaicus, (18): 598, (21): 601–602, (22) 603, (26): 611, (52): 643, (56): 647, etc.

¹⁰⁴ Grimlaicus, (20): 601.

¹⁰⁵ Irlich, p. 10. Wiborada, who lived from 916–929 in a cell attached to the St. Gall dependency of St. Mangen, did have a special claim to sanctity—she was martyred by Hungarian raiders.

of Trier (died 1035) as one of the greatest preachers of his age.¹⁰⁶ So many came to a female recluse near Verdun that she ended up founding a nunnery.¹⁰⁷ Other sources relate similar cases.¹⁰⁸

Recluses were expected to be able to avoid the temptations attendant on communication with the laity. They had regular exposure to worldly influences, because of a level of interaction with visitors from which contemporary monks did their best to escape. They did not always succeed in resisting these temptations. Grimlaicus complains that his contemporary recluses are not leading a suitable life; that, he says, is the main reason he is writing the *Regula solitariorum*.¹⁰⁹ Grimlaicus focuses especially on avarice continuing to tie the recluse to the world, bemoaning the fact that some recluses continue to collect worldly goods after their enclosure, or even begin the life of reclusion by inquiring about the material goods available in the place they are considering for their cell. He expects poverty to be a necessary ingredient of reclusive asceticism.¹¹⁰ It is likely that the recluse attached to a cathedral, about whose worldly life Rather of Verona complains, was also being criticized for his luxury and avarice.¹¹¹

Many recluses were considered especially holy, and this belief extended to some of the new monasteries of the eleventh century, which also stressed stability and austerity, linking parts of reclusive, eremitical, and monastic life, as we will see. Tales of miracles multiplied around recluses. Most commonly, recluses were held to be prophets. The recluse Gebehardus at Strassburg in the late ninth century had the gift of prophecy; the Irish Eusebius at about the same time could interpret dreams.¹¹² The most famous of the prophetic recluses was Wiborada. She frequently foretold the future, including, as already mentioned, the Hungarian invasion that led to her own death, and was able to warn the monks and people to take refuge.¹¹³

¹⁰⁶ *Vita Annonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis*, MGH SS 11, (II.11): 487.

¹⁰⁷ *Iohannes s. Arnulfi*, (52): 351.

¹⁰⁸ See for example Hartmannus, (II.13): 291; *Vita Liutbirgae*, (23): 27; and *Chronicon Hugesburgense*, p. 139. Peter the Venerable warns the recluse Gilbert not to let his head be turned by the multitude coming to him for advice. See Petrus Venerabilis, #20, p. 33.

¹⁰⁹ Grimlaicus, (prologus): 575, (27–28): 612–17.

¹¹⁰ Grimlaicus, (7): 584, (15): 593, (28): 617.

¹¹¹ Ratherius Veroniensis, *Sermo XI*, PL 136, (4): 753.

¹¹² Leclercq, "Reclus," p. 24 for Gebehardus. *Casus s. Galli*, (2): 93 tells how Eusebius was visited by a pregnant woman for an explanation of a dream. He told her to offer her child as an oblate to St. Gall.

¹¹³ Hartmannus, (III.24): 294.

The holiness of those enclosed was recognized both in their lifetimes and after their deaths. Grimlaicus praises the recluse as "imitator of the apostles," a claim also made for monastic missionaries. He presents a long argument that solitaries will be equal to the apostles at the Last Judgment, sitting as judges with them and Christ.¹¹⁴ They are thus apostles, but of a very different sort. Or was it so different? Both groups were active in tending Christianity, and in neither case do those involved conform to the monastic interpretation of apostolate as life together in community. Already in the sixth century the cell of reclusion was held up as an "angelic habitation," and authors believed that suffering its restrictions would lead to heavenly rewards.¹¹⁵ It is not at all strange to find even a quite ordinary recluse, who attracted no cult after his death and is otherwise unknown, mentioned in the *Annales s. Bavonis* as "a most holy man" (*vir sanctissimus*).¹¹⁶ Strange lights were reported above the tombs of other recluses and psalmody was heard, as in the case of Salome at Niederaltaich (d. c. 880) and the Irish recluse Animchadus who died at Fulda in 1043.¹¹⁷ Many recluses were remembered long after their deaths and laymen even requested burial near the cells that recluses had inhabited.¹¹⁸ The bodies of both Wiborada and her fellow recluse Rachild were formally transferred into the church next to which they had lived and, as I have mentioned, Wiborada was formally canonized.¹¹⁹ Simeon of Trier, despite accusations made against him of necromancy in his lifetime, was venerated after his death in 1035, and many cures were reported at his tomb. Indeed, in this instance, Simeon's friend Archbishop Poppo of Trier arranged for the dead

¹¹⁴ Grimlaicus, (6): 584, (3): 580–81.

¹¹⁵ *Vita Abrahae*, (8): 657, the Latin version of which dates from the sixth century. The *arenga* of Peter the Venerable's letter to the recluse Gilbert includes the invocation: "for the narrowness of your cell, the spaciousness of heaven" (*pro angusta cellae, latitudinem caeli*). Petrus Venerabilis, #20, p. 27.

¹¹⁶ This recluse Columbanus, described as an abbot from Ireland, took up reclusion in a cemetery in Ghent in 957 and died there in 959. See *Annales s. Bavonis Gandensis*, MGH SS 2 [a. 957, a. 959], p. 188.

¹¹⁷ *Vita Salomes*, (3): 456; Marianus Scottus [a. 1043], p. 557.

¹¹⁸ A document of Otto I from 956 speaks of "the cave in which Liutbirga was formerly a recluse," showing that her presence in the area was still remembered almost a century after her death. DOI, #186, p. 269. For analysis, see Grosse, p. 46. Thietmar of Merseburg, the bishop and chronicler (d. 1018), tells of a female relative of his who was buried at the place next to the monastery of Walbeck where the recluse Liutherdus had had his cell. Thietmar, (VI.85): 376.

¹¹⁹ Irblich, p. 169.

recluse's canonization by the pope and founded a monastery in his honor.¹²⁰

The key to the holiness of recluses was certainly their unique position with regard to the rest of Christian society. The act of enclosure was a type of initiation, but significantly different from most rites of initiation in various societies. Unlike most people who go through an initiation, recluses did not move on to reintegration with their community, or introduction to a new community, as was the case, for example, with the monastic profession. Instead, the recluse, ritually buried and sealed into a very real tomb, could never return to the world, a permanence of which society was well aware and which by the latter part of the ninth century was considered an absolutely necessary element of the reclusive life. No matter how withdrawn from the world a hermit might be, there was always a very real chance, indeed a probability, that he would sooner or later return to a more common form of life and thus lose this peculiarly mediatory role. Thus, unlike the hermit, the recluse was in a permanently liminal position, on a one-way street that could go only toward a future in heaven, and was thus particularly close to God and the saints.¹²¹

The great individuality of reclusion lies in the purpose for which it evolved: it was a vehicle for experts in the religious life, whose goal was to gain even greater expertise. Here the monks were the novices, if indeed they ever became concerned with personal contemplation, and recluses were the virtuosi. The virtuosi, the saints of this world, are not restricted in the ways of people of less genius, and all accepted recluses as virtuosi.¹²² They had gone beyond the rules that limited monks to a plodding adherence to a daily round of

¹²⁰ Eberwinus, (23): 91; Franz-Josef Heyen, "Simeon und Burchard-Poppo. Aus den Anfängen des Stiftes St. Simeon in Trier," in *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter*, ed. Lutz Fenske, et al. (Sigmaringen, 1984), p. 195; Johannes Jacobi, "Erzbischof Poppo von Trier (1016–1047). Ein Beitrag zur geistigen und politischen Situation der Reform" *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 13 (1961): 19. Simeon's wide fame can also be seen in Hugh of Flavigny's chronicle. He tells how in Antioch Richard of St. Vanne met "the man of God," Simeon, who now adorns the church of Trier with his body and virtues. Hugo Flaviniacensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 8, (II.20): 394. It is interesting to note that a concrete result of the cult of Simeon of Trier was the preservation of the Porta Nigra in that city—Simeon's cell had been in the gate itself—and after his death Poppo had a church built in the gate as a cult center, so the gate was preserved as a holy place. See Heyen, p. 195.

¹²¹ This paragraph is based on Warren, pp. 95–97.

¹²² One of the great difficulties in analyzing religious life in the earlier middle ages is that, although the best sources are frequently hagiographical, the saints very rarely fit into any kind of neat pattern.

obedience. Their popularity, however, emerged in an era of poor monastic observance. In the tenth century monks took on some of the nature of recluses, and in the eleventh it was possible to create an amalgamation of monk, hermit, and recluse that could be accepted as containing much of the religious prestige of the recluse.

In the course of the eleventh century the nature of reclusion itself was bending to accommodate to a variety of missions perceived as more important than strict adherence to the vow of stability, which had become a stumbling block rather than an aid in fighting for spiritual causes. We can see this in the *vita* of Herluca, a semi-recluse attached to the Hirsau reform circle at the time of the Investiture Contest. The existence of a semi-recluse would by itself have been a paradox a century before. What it meant in her case was strict stability, except when the needs of Christendom called her out of her cell and into the world. Paul of Bernried, her pro-papal hagiographer (who also wrote the *vita* of Pope Gregory VII) tells of her many visions, which include one of Christ teaching her not to hear mass from a bad priest and a vision in which the soul of an impure priest was being dragged to hell.¹²³ Thus she lent the spiritual authority of her reclusive life to the Church's fight for reform, as we will see monks also doing, despite their vow of stability.

Still, even as rules eased, the recluse walked a narrow way between care of the world and the special holiness of their stable state. The *vita* of Poppo of Stablo tells of problems at St. Maximin's, Trier, in the 1040's, which was plagued with bad abbots. A recluse was convinced to leave his cell, in the presumptuous hope that through his holiness he could effect a solution. He soon fell into sin and died, giving a good moral lesson on what happens to those breaking enclosure.¹²⁴ In this case, although the recluse's cause may have been good, he displayed both pride and self-will in his actions, both fatal, in this case literally, to his position in society's esteem.

By the end of the tenth century, reclusion, this special image of holiness, had come more and more to be applied in a watered down version to ordinary monks, thanks largely to the propaganda of the reforming congregations. They could use their reputation as good, stable monks, following the Benedictine Rule—there is a smugness

¹²³ Paulus Bernriedensi, *Vita b. Herlucae*, AASS Apr. II: 549–554. See especially (22–3): 551, and (24): 551–52.

¹²⁴ Everhelmus, *Vita Popponis abbatis Stabulensis*, MGH SS 11, (23): 309.

in the works by and about monks that emphasizes claustration and mild asceticism as separation from the world much like that of recluses. One would assume both that the people of the time would value the prayers of monks more highly, and that, molded by years in the monastery, monks who went out into the world to preach, teach, and argue with the ecclesiastical hierarchy would take on a greater aura of virtuosity in the religious life. The development of wandering preachers as a popular movement, although usually on the fringes of official acceptance, spelled the beginning of the end for recluses. Women, about half the reclusive population, could not be wanderers in the world, as firm belief in women's feebleness against temptation prevented them from attempting activities outside of the cloister. At the same time a small minority of monks credited themselves with greater willpower and turned to the hermitage and even the city. And as monks took on a greater aura of virtuosity in religious life, new demands came to be placed upon them that brought the monastic life into closer agreement with the principles motivating the interaction of recluses with secular society. Eventually it led to a reevaluation of their flight from the world, as monks accepted a spiritual role in the world that at times approximated that of recluses.

The cenobitic reforms of the tenth century went a long way toward creating some of the veneration toward monks traditionally accorded to recluses. In most houses, stability and prayer had become standard practice, rather than goals to be striven for or mocked. The confident air of many monastic writings, the sense in works such as the *vitae* of Wenceslas and of Gerald of Aurillac that monks carry a superior religious stature to that of the rest of fallen humanity, is at times palpable. The tools of reclusion accomplished some of this. Many monks appear to have alternated periods of reclusion or eremitism with the cenobitic life. With the model of recluses before them, all that was needed was enough monks of sufficient prestige to break the bond of stability and concern themselves more actively with the task of reforming the world.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE GODLY SOCIETY: MONKS AND REFORM IN THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

Missionary work on the frontiers of civilization has a certain romantic appeal, as does the devout life of a recluse. While the silence of the sources strongly suggests an attitude of official disapproval at times, other less involved observers were willing to lionize missionaries as they did recluses, whether Benedictine or not. One need only look at the widespread cult of Adalbert of Prague for an example. Conversion of pagans also had a clear link to the apostles that could not be ignored. But the Slavs and Magyars were far away from most writers, and these active monks who evangelized them could easily be ignored or forgotten. The same could not be said of the monks who precipitated the ecclesiastical reform movement of the eleventh century. They were in the middle of events, and western Europeans had to become accustomed to the sight of monks in new and often alarming roles.

We are entering a field often plagued with a confusing vocabulary, besides the confusion inherent in insufficient sources. Historians usually describe monks who labored for the reform of monastic life itself as reformers. Unfortunately, those involved in reform of all Christian society, reaching a pinnacle during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073–1085), are also usually just called “reformers.” The two groups overlapped, but were by no means identical. In this book, I separate the two organizations. “Reformer” designates someone working for monastic reform; “ecclesiastical” or “Church” reformer signifies someone trying to improve the spiritual organization of western Europe more generally. The two sorts are often combined—especially the founder of a new monastery in the eleventh century was likely to have been motivated at least in part by concern for ecclesiastical reform. This role especially took many monks from their cloisters in the eleventh century, and it is this history I attempt to trace.

i. *From missionary to wandering preacher*

Overcoming two centuries of tradition is not easy. Of the reforming fields, mission appears to have come first, both because its justification was more obvious and because of the historical accident that the German emperors were spreading their influence, including religion, to the lands on the east border of Germany. Missionary-monks supplied some justification for trying to carry their evangelical instincts to the often lax Christians at home. By the early eleventh century, the line between preaching to pagans and to lax Christians was becoming a very thin one, and some missionaries were as interested in ecclesiastical reform at home as they were in mission. Romuald of Ravenna is a good example of the connection or indeed sameness perceived between mission to pagans and to Christians. In the second chapter I wrote of his interest in missionary work in central Europe, while in the third chapter I discussed the life of ascetic withdrawal that could empower a holy person to take action in the world. It is this ascetic withdrawal, combined with significant involvement in the affairs of the world, that is of most interest to Romuald's hagiographer, Peter Damian. Damian especially praises Romuald as one of the first in Italy to fight actively against simony, while living an extremely ascetic life. It might have been Romuald who revived the practice of self-flagellation as an ascetic discipline, a level of asceticism that would bring him much closer to recluses than to traditional monks.¹ Another person we have examined only as a missionary, Bishop Wolfgang of Regensburg, continually worked "for the salvation of himself and others" both before and after his episcopal consecration, as his hagiographer relates.²

Other missionaries also became active within the boundaries of Christendom. Guibert, an early evangelizer of the Magyars, appears to have combined roles. A letter dated 963 praises this monk for exhorting evildoers by his example and constancy. A few lines later the author mentions Guibert specifically "exhorting" pagans, so

¹ Peter Damian points to Romuald as a perfect hermit, and praises those who emulate him. Peter does seem, though, to have heard of earlier self-flagellation. He praises Romuald's time as a gold age, because of the great number of hermits. See Petrus Damiani, *Vita beati Romualdi*, ed. Giovanni Tabacco (Rome, 1957), (64): 105-106.

² "pro sua aliorumque salute." Othloh s. Emmerammi, *Vita Wolfkangi*, MGH SS 4, (12): 530.

apparently the former reference was to activities among Christians.³ Gunther the Hermit began as a preacher to pagan Slavs, but his contemporaries also knew him as a harsh judge of the Church's lax rulers. There is also a very interesting report of him as a teacher of penitence—as Grauert puts it, a reborn John the Baptist advocating the deeper spiritual conversion of an already superficially Christian population.⁴

Such brief references as we have of men like Gunther the Hermit raise many questions about the state of monasticism and the religiosity of the eleventh century overall. A new John the Baptist preaching repentance seems much more typical of the early twelfth century than of the turn of the millennium. The early twelfth-century wandering preachers of France, such as Robert of Arbrissel, are fairly well known. In the hagiographical accounts of this French movement they almost always seem to appear suddenly, with no antecedents. Following the extremely influential work of Walter and Grundmann, historians have presented these wandering holy men as a symptom of the new religious enthusiasm and diversity of the late Gregorian reform. The general view is that they gained a firm start with a papal license to preach Christian morality—and opposition to simony—to the laity.⁵ But what then do we make of a figure like Gunther the Hermit, who appears to have gained a considerable reputation in southeastern Germany as a penitential preacher and extremely active force in a

³ Abbot Erluinus, included by Sigebertus in his *Vita Wicberti*, MGH SS 8: 516.

⁴ Othloh s. Emmerammi, *Liber visionum*, MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, vol. 13, (14): 82–83 reports a vision of him. See Hermann Grauert, “Rom und—Gunther der Eremit?” *HJb* 19 (1898): 249–87, especially p. 269, for Gunther's reputation as a preacher to Christians.

⁵ The best sources for our knowledge of Robert and Bernard are Baldricus, *Vita b. Roberti de Arbrissello*, PL 162: 1043–58 and Gaufridus Grossus, *Vita b. Bernardi Tironiensis*, PL 172: 1363–1446. These wandering hermits are well covered in Johannes von Walter's *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1903/1906), a book of enduring value. See also Herbert Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1961), who places the wandering preachers of the twelfth century at the pinnacle of a society that was more deeply affected by the “apostolic” life of poverty. See passim. For a general overview see Henrietta Leyser, *Hermits and the New Monasticism* (New York, 1984). One particularly interesting analysis of the wandering preachers is in Jean-Marc Bienvenu, “Aux origines d'un ordre religieux: Robert d'Arbrissel et la fondation de Fontevraud (1101)” *Cahiers d'histoire* 20 (1975): 227–51. He presents an argument that the wandering preachers were a new phenomenon of the early twelfth century as a result of demographic change (ignoring the fact that both *vitae* speak often of preaching and arguing at the level of the rural parish, rather than appearing in an urban environment). As one can see from the argument of this book, I agree with neither Grundmann nor with Bienvenu.

variety of political and ecclesiastical issues of his day, well before the greater ecclesiastical reform had its official debut with the Synods of Rome and Sutri in 1046?

Any historian faces a double problem when she suggests that the origins of the wandering preaching movement began, not with Robert of Arbrissel or at the earliest with Gregorian preachers such as the monks of Hirsau, but with these monks of the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. The religious history of the eleventh century, one of the greatest periods of change in both spirituality and ecclesiastical organization that western Europe has known, has been studied relatively little by anyone except Investiture Contest historians. For the most part research tastes draw medievalists either to the puzzling and scarce sources of the early middle ages, or to the much richer and more complex research possibilities connected with the twelfth century and later. The bridge period between, which seems to have a foot in both worlds, has been neglected. There are fewer sources from the eleventh century than for later periods, and they are harder to interpret.

Perhaps the most difficult issue when seeking antecedents for new religious patterns in the eleventh century is the attitude of contemporary commentators. In the early twelfth century the wandering preacher Robert of Arbrissel was defined within an ideology of evangelization that was at least fully conscious by his time, if still hotly contested. He founded a nunnery and his work and justification for it was provided by a school of his supporters and disciples. Another wandering preacher, Norbert of Xanten, had the propaganda power of an entire congregation that he had brought into being, the Praemonstratensian canons, to assert the rectitude of their founder's actions as an evangelizing revivalist. These new congregations had been established with very different goals and priorities from those of traditional mainstream Benedictine monasticism even when, as with Fontevault, Robert of Arbrissel's foundation, they still were ruled by a framework of the Benedictine Rule. They also worked with or in opposition to an element not available to the monks of this study: the papacy. The monks of the tenth and eleventh centuries had no centralized institution to support or use them. Early eleventh-century monks who took an interest in affairs of the broader world were judged by contemporaries in the only terms for the religious life with which they were familiar—a Benedictine monasticism overlaid by several centuries of tradition, still based firmly on the attitudes of the

Anianian reform of the early ninth century. We cannot know how often chroniclers just shook their heads and passed over in silence the oddities of their contemporary fellow monks, who were acting in what they perceived as a very improper way. Still, the annalistic and hagiographical literature, both for and against these would-be active monks, often reveals the barriers of incomprehension such monks had to face.

Activity in the world was not “normal” for a monk. Because of their location and the fact that they were not dealing with pagans, monks who played an active role within Christendom had to be defended and explained to an even more critical audience than did the missionaries examined in the second chapter. Their annalists and hagiographers had to explain that these monks, showing their sympathy and activity among a larger than monastic audience, had not really betrayed their profession. And from the beginning, the best arguments in favor of the new movements took them beyond the parameters of traditional Benedictine thought. Monks who were drawn to a more active role in the world appear to have justified themselves with two theories, used together or separately, that had little to do with the Benedictine Rule as the average monk of the time understood it: first, the role of Christians to help others to a godly life; and second, the duty, imposed both externally and internally, of experts in virtue to share their skill with others. In other words, these would-be reformers had made themselves into virtuosi in religion, and, analogously to recluses, claimed that their superior religious life was a precondition to work in the world. They are also the same arguments as those used to defend mission, but with an added element of judging less perfect fellow Christians, an element that became explosive when employed against the ecclesiastical hierarchy itself.

For sources that shed a light upon monastic attitudes in the tenth century, turning to Burgundy is necessary, since the early Cluniacs provide reflective treatises lacking, at least now, from the extant German monastic corpus. Already in c. 930 Odo of Cluny argued that it is the duty of any Christian, apparently including monks, to speak out against sin. He buttressed his argument with a biblical quotation that would become a central text in the issue of monastic preaching a century after his death: “Cursed is he who keeps back his sword from bloodshed” (Jer 48.10).⁶

⁶ Odo Cluniacensis, *Collationes*, PL 133, (II.17): 563.

Odo was probably drawing this citation from the inspiration of Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care*, which relates the text to the duty of preachers to speak up in the cause of moral rectitude; the full citation in Jeremiah warns against slackness in God's service.⁷ Still, why was a monk including such advice in a book of moral teaching intended more for other monks than for members of the secular clergy? To state that Gregory I was a popular author in the tenth century, so that such a reference would come automatically to mind, only partially answers such a question. Odo obviously considered these words in some way applicable to monks. But how? The question is whether monks actually applied such lessons of Christian duty, or whether these authoritative statements were spiritualized or allegorized, rather than leading to a more positive stance that included physical presence in the world.

The early Cluniacs fall into an odd halfway state between activity in and retreat from the world. There is no evidence that the monks themselves were concerned with secular matters; Urban II (1088–1099) (himself a former grand prior of Cluny) could still praise the Cluniacs for their separation from worldly affairs, as “the light of the world,” examples for others rather than participants in the squalor of mundane affairs.⁸ There are a few hints even as early as Odo, however, that the abbots of Cluny did go beyond writing to involvement in greater lay and ecclesiastical affairs. In writing, Odo frequently expressed deep concern for the moral state of Christian society. He interspersed his works with references to the duty of everyone to work toward the improvement of Christian life, even members of the laity, as he shows in his *vita* of Count Gerald of Aurillac. But Odo's abbacy also saw the early stages of Cluniac abbots involving themselves in the affairs of the broader world.

In Odo's case, there is little evidence that he went beyond the reform of other monasteries to bring them to conformity with the Benedictine Rule and the customs in use at Cluny. Even that level of interaction with the world brought him into contact with the secular leaders of his day, though. For most of the tenth century his successors cautiously emulated him, acting at times as advisors in both

⁷ Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Henry Davis (New York, 1950), (III.25): 177. (SC 382, p. 430.)

⁸ Cited by Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1982), p. xviii. The original is found in Urban's epistle 214, PL 151: 486.

ecclesiastical and civil affairs, besides pursuing their more "natural" function as monastic reformers. Still, one should note that such action was limited until the abbatiates of Odilo (d. 1049). Also very important to bear in mind is that we hear about the activity of abbots, not of the average choir monks.

The abbots of Cluny, like most abbots in Germanic lands in the tenth century, were members of at least the middling nobility. As such, they had appearances to keep up before the world and a natural function as advisors and intermediaries. They maintained a separate lodging from that of their monks, with separate dining facilities where they entertained important visitors to the monastery. A monk who became abbot moved away from most constraints of communal life, just as a monk who was elected to the episcopate was assumed to have moved into a different world. He did not in either case cease to be a monk, and sometimes maintained an ostentatiously monastic lifestyle, but this was optional, not mandatory. The enjoyable or awkward position (depending on the man's interests) abbots held as defenders of the bridge between the outside world and the cloister put them effectively into categories scarcely touched by the monastic literature of the tenth century.

ii. *The monk as spiritual adept*

Therefore it is difficult to disentangle the activities of abbots as noblemen from their role as representatives of a monastic way of thought. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that tenth-century authors saw no great tension in the amphibious role abbots were called upon to play, any more than they found it necessary to comment on the tribulations of monk-bishops. While of course these men continued to be monks while holding their new offices—monastic profession is a permanent state—their essence as monks was not jeopardized by their new and necessary functions, at least in the traditional Benedictine establishment. Difficulties arose only when a reformed monastery touted the individual spiritual state of each monk, including the abbot or prior, and attempted in the process to *define* itself in terms of greater withdrawal from the cares of the world than traditional Benedictines sought. In such circumstances the ruler of the monastery, as representative of a consciously reactionary group, carried the burden of presenting his community's ideology within the framework of the

normal expectations for an abbot to attend synods, advise, exhort, etc. And when, by the early years of the eleventh century, various abbots were defining their position in regard to both community and world in very different terms from each other, an atmosphere of criticism and competition became inevitable. Thus we have the buildup of two camps that did not require filiation to a particular reform direction. Instead the important distinction was between those attempting to emphasize the role of the monk as essentially separate from secular society (except the service of prayer) and those who stressed the nature of the monk as a good Christian, who therefore had a natural duty to help the rest of humanity by any means possible. Interestingly, both groups emphasized asceticism and strict rules, the one to maintain separation, the other to give monks the moral and spiritual authority to act in the world. And of course there was a third group, much larger than the other two: those who continued to lead the traditional Benedictine life as they had inherited it from generations of spiritual forebears.

It is probably a moot point whether certain individuals and groups within the Benedictine tradition embraced a world-sympathetic stand willingly or had it thrust upon them. The hagiographical literature, admittedly playing a didactic role and therefore sharing many elements of the world-accepting movement in monasticism, depicts involvement in outside cares as often unavoidable and inevitable. Wolfgang, as a simple monk of Einsiedeln, lived so virtuously that many people from the surrounding countryside came to see him for religious advice, at least according to his hagiographer.⁹ Thus hagiographers were putting him into a mold already familiar to us from recluses. From the number of such references, it is likely that this reflects reality. Some monks, because of their reputation for superior holiness, appear to have been taking on some of the spiritual roles of recluses. If a monk developed a reputation for godly prowess, whether he wanted it or not, he became the focus for the spiritually ambitious of the neighborhood. This was the case both for traditional monks and for those who left in some way the sphere of activity or asceticism typical of the monastery, whether they moved to individual huts in the forest, or to a monastery such as Camaldoli that had taken on some non-Benedictine customs. While some hermits responded to such

⁹ Othloh, *Vita Wolfgangi*, (10): 530.

an invasion of privacy with flight to the hills,¹⁰ others at least accepted this care of spiritually needy Christians with good grace, and as a corollary to the spiritual guidance of many recluses and hermits in the past.

Like a recluse, a Benedictine monk did not have flight from his fans as an option. The better the reputation of the monk or of the whole community, the harder it would have been to resist the pressure of the spiritually needy. Another particularly wayward monk shows what a persistent search for solitude could do. This monk, Simeon (d. 1035), became a servant to a hermit across the Jordan after he had made the pilgrimage to the Holy Land. When the hermit released him from his service, Simeon went off to a more isolated area. However, soon too many people came to him. Perhaps to escape the situation, the harried monk accepted Richard of St. Vanne's invitation to return with him to western Europe, and settled as a recluse in a tower of the Porta Nigra in Trier, apparently hoping for more peace in a strange land.¹¹ As one can see in the case of Wolfgang, even a monastery as devoted to its solitude as Einsiedeln could not avoid, or perhaps did not even try to avoid, such commitments. One can only imagine the pressure brought to bear on the abbots of a famous house like Cluny to intervene, counsel, and inspire. A community became known for its spiritual prowess, usually displayed by withdrawal from the world, and won a regard close to that of recluses. As honey draws flies, besides those just searching for the benefit of their prayers, monasteries quite naturally attracted those seeking religious advice and education. The issue for many important monasteries thus became whether to discourage lay pressure or limit it to the abbot, or for the monks to commit themselves to involvement, if not in the daily cares of the world, at least in the greater needs of the *ecclesia*.

¹⁰ The best example I know of is in the late ninth-century *Vita s. Meginrati*, MGH SS 15,1: 444–48, especially (5–6): 446. Meinrad became a hermit, only to have to endure the company of some of his students from the monastic school. He went to a remoter area, where a sympathetic countrywoman provided him with food. But after seven years he could no longer stand the multitude of people who came to him. So he moved up into the mountains where it would be more difficult for people to find him.

¹¹ Eberwinus, *Vita s. Symeonis*, AASS Iun. I: 85–92.

iii. *Entanglement with ecclesiastical reform*

The mark of holiness was separation from the world. This at times produced a very complicated picture, as many monks of old established houses found themselves edged into worldly affairs while at the same time upholding traditional contempt of the world. Thus the desire for intramural monastic reform, the establishment of new moral standards in the Church, and even the strengthening of the juridical authority of the papacy often went hand in hand. An important example of the complexity of this early period of transition is the case of Abbo of Fleury, a zealous monastic and ecclesiastical reformer who was martyred in 1004 while attempting to reform the monastery of La Réole. The immediate cause of his death was that he had disciplined a monk for leaving the monastic enclosure, who in turn stirred up revolt against him, a very typical situation for a tenth-century reformer. Tales of murdered abbots are not rare, and as late as the twelfth century Peter Abelard barely escaped drinking the poison his unruly monks had put into the eucharistic chalice. Abbo appears to have tried to win the monks over with his humility, as had Odo of Cluny, who is said to have started the reform of Fleury several generations before by riding alone, humbly and unarmed, to the monastery; luckily, the monks were so inspired by this perhaps calculated risk that they accepted reform without any compulsion.¹² In Abbo's case, protection of monasteries, a normal and expected role for an abbot, led him naturally into wider concerns. Abbo had much to say on the subject of monastic liberties, and his course in trying to protect Fleury from outside influences brought him into conflict with his bishop. He was vehemently against episcopal visitations to religious houses, when the bishop brought a largely lay entourage and their inevitable disturbance into the cloister.¹³ He

¹² Aimo Floriacensis, *Vita Sancti Abbonis*, PL 139, (20): 410. See Patrice Cousin, *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire* (Paris, 1954), pp. 172–89 for analysis of Abbo. As John of Salerno depicts Odo's reform of Fleury, Odo went alone to the monastery, riding on a donkey, in a clearly christological vignette. Cf. John of Salerno, *The Life of St. Odo of Cluny*, in *St. Odo of Cluny*, ed. and trans. Gerard Sitwell (London, 1958), (III.9): 80–81. Even if the historical Odo did not perfectly fit John's ideal, we can learn from this text, written shortly after Odo's death, that at least this author was beginning to write in a new idiom—that of imitation of Christ.

¹³ Abbo Floriacensis, *Collectio canonum*, PL 139, (XV): 484–86. See Gregory I, *Registrum*, MGH Epist. 1, (V.49), p. 349 for his source; cf. Giles Constable, "Monasteries, Rural Churches and the *Cura animarum* in the Early Middle Ages," in

was also influenced strongly enough by Cluny to see the pope as the natural defender of monasticism. As a result he defended the rights of the Holy See with a warmth unequalled in his time: a strong pope would in turn protect loyal monasteries like Fleury from the encroachments both of interfering diocesans and of secular lords.

Thus far Abbo's interests fell well within the realm of traditional monastic roles. Nevertheless the very strength of his conviction that monasticism was a higher and separate order, intended to be independent from the control of less holy outsiders, brought him into the realm of ecclesiastical politics. He fought particularly against simony, the buying and selling of holy things, taking an early stand against the purchase of ecclesiastical offices and lay possession of Church goods.¹⁴ The connection between simony and the establishment of good order within monasticism was a simple one: in his opinion, unholy and avaricious bishops tried to exert too much control over Fleury, as did laymen, who could hardly even be hoped to behave decently and leave monasteries to their own business. Monasteries, especially large and rich ones, needed a spokesman with a better grasp of theology than of economics. So Abbo considered it natural to turn to the pope, as German monasteries looked to the protection of the emperor. Thanks to its connection with Cluny, Fleury already had papal privileges, documents that gave a monastery special rights such as the right to elect its own abbot, to follow its existing customs, even granting such mundane things as the right to hold a fishery in perpetuity.¹⁵ So Abbo, thoroughly influenced by papal claims of superiority, even though the papacy was weak and corrupt at the time, put Fleury under papal authority. It was probably a wise choice, since the pope was far enough away that he would not interfere on a daily basis, and at the same time he was at least in theory an authority superior to both bishops and laymen.

Much of the history of religion in the early and central middle ages and the potential for monks to be involved in change is ex-

Christianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica, vol. 1, Settimana Spoleto 28 (1982), p. 373 for analysis of the sources.

¹⁴ Abbo Floriacensis, *Apologeticus ad Hugonem et Rodbertum reges Francorum*, PL 139: 465–67; see also Cousin, pp. 31–32; Jean-François Lemarignier, "L'exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme grégorienne," in *A Cluny* (Dijon, 1950), p. 304.

¹⁵ A good look at life at Fleury is Adrevaldus, Aimoinus, et al., *Les miracles de saint-Benoît*, ed. E. de Certain (Paris, 1858).

pressed in Abbo's turn to the pope for authority. The papacy was in considerable disarray, and the pope was not very edifying when viewed as a potential holy man. Yet both sides came well out of the deal. Papal protection over a monastery was the only way the pope could have exhibited his authority in the Loire Valley. On the other hand, few bishops or even noblemen were willing to attack or try to diminish a house that had been placed into the hands of St. Peter. It was also an early stage of muddying the waters that clearly divided the proper role of each sector of society. Papal privileges often stole the rights over an abbey that a local bishop or noble had traditionally held.

One of Abbo's most important sources for his monastic and political position was Gregory the Great's letters. While Gregory's role as monk turned bishop had certainly not been forgotten in the centuries since his death in 604, the tendency, encouraged by the magnitude and variety of his output, has always been to deal with him either as a monastic spiritual leader or as an episcopal authority figure dealing with ecclesiastical affairs. Of course he was both.¹⁶ Abbo laid some of the foundation for a reformation of the *ecclesia*, a foundation that accepted as axiomatic Gregory I's assertions that bishops must balance their lives between action and contemplation, expanding the idea to include all professional religious. As we will see, the interpretation of Gregory's career as an "active monk" played a key role in the polemical literature of the late eleventh century.

An increasing number of examples exist from the early years of the eleventh century depicting Benedictine monks who entered public affairs as preachers and writers in favor of general ecclesiastical reform, rather than reform of monasteries. This was an area that could not fail to touch monks, since by the eleventh century more than half the monks of an average abbey were priests.¹⁷ Whether as

¹⁶ See for example Jeffrey Richards, *Consul of God* (London/Boston, 1980) and Carole E. Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988) for two very different books about the same man.

¹⁷ There were many monks who were ordained priests. Constable, "Monasteries," p. 359 argues that by the ninth through tenth centuries the abbot was expected to be a priest, although the two ninth-century commentaries on the Benedictine Rule matter-of-factly provide for who should celebrate mass and other functions requiring ordination, if the abbot was not a priest. Otto Nußbaum, *Kloster, Priestermonch und Privatmesse* (Bonn, 1961), p. 80 cites a statistical analysis by Mettler, showing that by c. 800 already 23–32% of monks were priests. By the end of the ninth century, approximately 55% of monks would have been ordained. Constable argues that the rise to prominence of the priest-monk can largely be explained because of the need for monks as parish clergy, and to continue with regional evangelism. See

cause or result of this phenomenon, the Eucharist was taking a much more central place in monastic ritual than it had in earlier centuries. The anger roused in the eleventh century by Berengar of Tours' arguments against transubstantiation, which contemporaries understood as a rejection of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist,¹⁸ created a furor that would have been inconceivable in the ninth century when Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus politely debated the same issue.¹⁹ By the eleventh century, the sacred nature of the Eucharist was central to monastic spirituality, while better means of communication and increasing numbers of students meant that news and arguments traveled more swiftly. One of Berengar's main opponents, Lanfranc of Bec, was a monk.²⁰ More generally, correct interpretation of God's will regarding the sacraments was central to the ecclesiastical politics of the reform movement; identifying the nature of the Eucharist must have mingled with the great turn against simony. Whether or not the Eucharist is indeed the true body and blood of Christ, it must have been widely regarded as blasphemy for so many, either monks or secular clergy, to treat so great a sacrament lightly—otherwise the whole theoretical underpinning of the Gregorian reform collapses. Hence simony, vending the ability to perform the miracle of the Eucharist, and the need for a religious secular clergy who would treat the sacrament with proper respect, were issues that involved every Christian, especially (as I suspect either a monastic or ecclesiastical reformer would have argued) monks, whose lives were focused around several daily celebrations of the mass.

"Monasteries," p. 363. Hofmeister, on the contrary, presents a large body of evidence to argue that the growing number of priests in monasteries was more due to expansions of the liturgy than ministry. See Philipp Hofmeister, "Mönchtum und Seelsorge bis zum 13. Jahrhundert" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 65 (1953–54): 209–73, especially p. 228. Certainly the wish for all abbots to be ordained took a very long time to take root. The issue came up in many Church councils: 826, 853, 868, 1078, 1227, and 1484. See Hofmeister, p. 226.

¹⁸ Allan J. MacDonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (Merrick, New York, 1930 (reprint ed. 1977)), p. 354.

¹⁹ Berengar drew his arguments predominantly from rhetoric. Though most of the debate and condemnation of his views came from monks, he was not a monk himself. A good general history of the Eucharistic controversy can be found in MacDonald, *passim*. See also Charles E. Sheedy, *The Eucharistic Controversy of the Eleventh Century against the Background of Proto-scholastic Theology* (Washington, D.C., 1947).

²⁰ These two abbots had very interesting treatises reflecting their views, but no one, even the writers of annals from the debaters' home cloister, seem to have noticed or cared. Ratramnus of Corbie, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, PL 121: 103–71; Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 16 (1963).

The best evidence that monks appeared more in the public sphere is in descriptions of moderates, who worked an element of world-conscious behavior into an otherwise traditional life built around the Benedictine Rule. These are the men who remained within the fold of a monastery and thus found their way into monastic annals or even merited the attention of a hagiographer. The hagiographical literature is full of saintly abbots and monks who led their fellows within the monastic enclave to a better life. In other cases, though, it is difficult to tell whether these preachers' activities were limited to the cloister or reached a wider circle. For example, Bardo, a monk of Fulda who later became archbishop of Mainz (1031-1051), was credited with an interesting list of virtues while still a monk: God armed him, the author of his *vita* reports, with humility, the patience of simplicity, justice, and "adorned him with the arrows of preaching" and brotherly love.²¹ Did this mean that Bardo went out to preach moral reform to the surrounding countryside, or merely that he exhorted his fellow monks?

iv. *The revival of eremitism*

One of the clearest signs of how seriously individuals within the monastic institute took the cause of ecclesiastical reform is the growing number of hermits in the eleventh century, especially those hermits whose decision to leave the cloister was based on episcopal or abbatial simony. It was these people, including such leaders as Romuald of Ravenna and John Gualbert, who eventually settled down to found the very reform-minded community of Vallombrosa, who really made the issues of simony and nicolaitism (clerical marriage) known to the people of Italy, as did their counterparts such as William of Dijon in Germanic parts of the Empire and in France.

Like hermits who gradually moved into ecclesiastical reform, or like recluses who increasingly saw education of the laity as an important part of their duty in the world even to the point of breaking the vow of reclusion for its sake, these new ecclesiastical reformers already had a tradition of contact with the world. Eremitism's revival created a marked change from ecclesiastical attitudes of the eleventh

²¹ "adornavit sagittis praedicationis." *Vita Bardonis maior*, MGH SS 11, (5): 325.

century, and the fact that we know as much as we do about eleventh-century hermits suggests either a change of heart among the ecclesiastical authorities or an inability to stem the flood of vocations to the hermitage. The standard view in the tenth century was that eremitism was dangerous. Just to begin, there was a very real hazard of starving to death in an uninhabited area. This is well illustrated in the poem of Abbot John Kolobos, whose author gleefully develops a tale from the desert fathers about the foolishness of pretensions to holiness. John Kolobos decided he wanted to "become an angel" and left his monastery for the forest. He lived in the wilderness for a week, after which, very hungry and tired, he came back to his monastery and begged to be let in. His monks, mocking the quick end to his conversion to a superior life, replied that it could not possibly be Abbot John knocking at the door—he had gone off to become an angel. They did not let him in until the following morning.²² As does other satirical poetry, the tale of John Kolobos helps us understand how his society functions. The author is unlikely to have picked out this old story as his subject unless it had some resonance for him, nor was it likely to have circulated widely if people had not wanted to laugh at eremitical pretensions. Perhaps it indicates that the ecclesiastical establishment disapproved of an eremitical movement. Other sources emphasize the spiritual pitfalls of the isolated hermitage. For example, Adhegrinus, a friend of Odo of Cluny, became a hermit. While alone, he fell into despair and was only saved by an angel who reassured him about his spiritual standing.²³ To be totally alone was frightening, in spiritual as well as physical terms.²⁴

We know about some of the eleventh-century hermits, recluses, and

²² *Carmina Cantabrigiensia*, MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol., #42, pp. 97–101. This poem, written in Lotharingia in the tenth century, gained wide circulation. It is based on a short account in the *Sayings of the Fathers*, which can be found in *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, trans. Benedicta Ward (Kalamazoo, 1975), (John the Dwarf. 2): 86. See Heinrich Fichtenau, *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1984), 2: 332; Martin Bechthum, *Beweggründe und Bedeutung des Vagantentums in der Lateinischen Kirche des Mittelalters* (Jena, 1941), p. 50 to place this poem in its tenth-century context.

²³ John of Salerno, (I.25): 27–28.

²⁴ Fichtenau points out that there were few individualists in the tenth century, and separation from a community was considered punishment. He shows that life in a foreign land was equivalent to exile, and that a stranger had no legal protection. Heinrich Fichtenau, "Reisen und Reisende," in his *Beiträge zur Mediävistik* (Stuttgart, 1986), 3: 1.

those who combined the two lives, only because of the attraction they held for others—monks, clerics, and laymen—who were disgruntled with the religious life of the time. The early hermits were harried in the Near East and Egypt for their individualism, and were known as general disturbers of the peace, but these hermits were never united by a common cause. Eremitism existed in Charlemagne's empire, and the number of references in royal and episcopal letters and capitularies make it plain that neither Church nor State could stop wandering hermits. I suspect that in the period in which records of them increase again, most of Europe was beginning to rectify the damage caused by Vikings, Magyars, and Saracens. There was probably an ample number of hermits during the destructions of the ninth century, but fewer hermits or recluses were part of a monastery's system. When sources start reappearing in the late tenth century, wandering monk/hermits first showed themselves as missionaries to foreign lands (for example the five hermits martyred in Poland), but also became the champions of positive ecclesiastical reform, or else became anticlerical heretics. As the cause of ecclesiastical reform became ever more powerful, heresy died down, because it seemed that they could reach their goals legitimately. Thus the reformers belonged to any number of monasteries. They were part of a grand army that broke the chain of command to fight for a single cause.

We only know the small amount we do about hermits and other uncloistered preachers because more traditional monks and clerics hated them enough to write down their views and pressured them strongly enough to force at least partial conformity to the monastic structure. A vociferous hermit like Romuald attracted disciples, but because of the pressures of the time eventually some sort of structure had to be formed to contain them. Some of these communities have had a long existence and give us valuable evidence of their founding fathers, although later monks with different notions of monastic propriety have often edited the information extensively. It is important to note that adoption of a monastic life was frequently a spontaneous decision of the hermits, with no trace of interference by any authorities. A desire to control and regulate was thus certainly not the sole motivation for such a transition, at least in many cases. Many hermitages gradually became monasteries: Einsiedeln, Pereum (Romuald of Ravenna's foundation), Rinchnach (a community that grew up around Gunther the Hermit), just to name the most famous examples. Nevertheless, these hermitage/monasteries, especially in their early

years, often followed in their masters' footsteps and placed a high premium on concern for both lay spirituality and the purification of the Church.

Thus by the year 1000 the role recluses and hermits played among the laity was giving new ideas to monks, who still called themselves followers of Benedict, but increasingly abandoned much of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Benedictine Rule. This leaves us with two very different tracks for the eremitical life. On one hand we find the new "eremitical" congregations and individual monasteries that begin to dot the landscape beginning in the late tenth century. These communities were in most ways indistinguishable from a traditional monastery, but were dedicated collectively to a more careful withdrawal from the world than could usually be found in monasticism within the Empire. Thus the monks of Einsiedeln in Swabia referred to themselves as "hermits" though they were a permanent community following the Benedictine Rule, and there emerged in Italy in the early eleventh century several religious congregations that claimed inspiration from the hermits of the Egyptian Desert and therefore have become known as "eremitical congregations," such as the Camaldolesi.²⁵ As did all people with pretensions to holiness, such groups aimed for a theoretical ideal of the hermit's life, based on a very real separation from life outside of, in this case, the monastery. But as many leaders of these mixed congregations were hermits they approached contact with the world on rather different terms, probably expecting more accommodation to the desires of the laity than did monks with their long emphasis on cloistered virtue. They accepted the ideal of separation, but, like recluses, seem to have found the experience empowering. Withdrawal made action in the world possible. These hermits are familiar to students of the eleventh century, thanks especially to the work of Peter Damian in propagating the Camaldolese congregation. But successive leaders also had to maintain the spiritual direction of the founder. If not, the new houses quickly turned from Church reform, forgetting that their roots lay in protest against simony and corruption.

On the other hand, significant numbers of Benedictines left their monasteries for the individual or group hermitage. We do not know

²⁵ For Einsiedeln, see Hagen Keller, *Kloster Einsiedeln im ottonischen Schwaben* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1964), especially pp. 31–35, 94. See also Wilhelm Kurze, "Campus Malduli. Die Frühgeschichte Camaldolis" *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 44 (1964): 1–34.

how many, but mentions of them turn up in the sources from Germany, Italy, even from newly Christianized lands such as Poland.²⁶ When these hermits appear in the sources, they are often playing a quite active role in society. As early as c. 950 the *vita* of John of Gorze tells of several hermits who were involved in the foundation of Gorze, and who gave spiritual advice to John and others.²⁷ These active hermits had to face criticism because they did not fit the mold of religious propriety. As early as the middle of the tenth century some hermits were noted for their wandering propensities, and for what appeared to be an excessive interest in lay affairs. German sources note their activities with disapproval. John of Gorze visited one such hermit, named Lantbertus. He is described as "very rustic," and John's hagiographer notes his customs in terms that suggest their impropriety. He tells how: "suddenly rushing forth from his hermitage because of some impulse, Lantbertus entered villages and cities, and likewise unexpectedly he hid in his cell."²⁸ The language the author uses implies that he considered such a degree of mobility highly improper. To move about, however the urge might take him at the moment, was no fit life for a religious person. "Impulse" was the opposite of sound religious life. No person with traditional Benedictine values could approve such a course. What was Lantbertus doing? What business took him among his fellow humans? The hagiographer does not tell us.

Other hermits combined a reputation for holiness with an active stance toward the world, much as Gregory the Great had suggested for bishops, and by the eleventh century positive accounts join the lampoons and criticisms of the period of Gorzian and Cluniac dominance. Raoul Glaber, when his chronicle reaches the year 1021, tells of a hermit in southern Italy who saved the people of the town of Troja in Apulia by inspiring the Greek emperor Basil to mercy.²⁹

²⁶ Jerzy Kloczowski, "L'érémisme dans les territoires slaves occidentaux," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente nei Secoli XI e XII*, Settimana Mendola 2 (1965): 330–54.

²⁷ Iohannes s. Arnulfi, *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis*, MGH SS 4, (22): 343, (30–31): 345. Genicot asserts that there were many hermits in Lotharingia in the tenth century, and that in some areas they had a special vogue, but cites little evidence to support this. See Léopold Genicot, "L'érémisme du XI^e siècle dans son contexte économique et social," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 49–50.

²⁸ "Subito quolibet mentis impulsu ex heremo se propiciens, villas et civitates subintravit, itemque repente cellulae condidit." Iohannes s. Arnulfi, (22): 343.

²⁹ Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford, 1989), (III.4): 100–102.

Other references are suggestive but annoyingly short, as with the hermit Wanlef (d. 1013), who lived near Ilsenburg. No *vita* survives concerning him, and imperial documents do not mention him, so very little is known about him. But he appears to have been profoundly venerated and noblemen and women sought him out, including Emperor Henry III. Thietmar of Merseburg calls Wanlef "a true Israelite" (cf. Jn 1.47). His readers would doubtless know that the rest of the citation is Jesus' identification of a true Israelite as one in whom there is no guile. Such a reference suggests that he had a reputation for honesty and upright dealing, which fits well with the notion of a man who had considerable contact and influence in secular society.³⁰

Not all monks had the safety and reputation of Wanlef. Some encountered objections to their preaching and physical violence, to judge from Ekkebertus' *Vita Haimeradi*. The earliest period of his life for which we have information is that Haimrad was in the service of a woman, who had him ordained as a priest and gave him his freedom.³¹ Haimrad decided to go on several pilgrimages, and then became a monk at Hersfeld, where he remained until 1012. He did not get along with the abbot, though, and eventually fled the monastery. He finally settled at a place called Hasungen where he gathered a circle of disciples and lived until his death in June 1019.³² As long as he wandered in and out of various dioceses, he was treated with hostility. His holiness was only recognized after he settled at Hasungen, where many came to hear his preaching.³³ Before that, according to the *vita*, all he received was ridicule.

This *vita* is particularly difficult to interpret because the subject died in 1019 and Ekkebertus, the hagiographer, did not write until c. 1076–1080, during the first campaigns of the Investiture Contest. I believe that Ekkebertus shows clear signs of Gregorian influence. There is no way to know whether Haimrad actually preached against

³⁰ Thietmar Merseburgensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 9, (VI.90): 382. A discussion of the known material about Wanlef appears in Herbert Grundmann, "Eremiti in Germania dal X al XII Secolo: 'Einsiedler' e 'Klausner,'" in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, p. 315.

³¹ Ekkebertus, *Vita Sancti Haimeradi*, MGH SS 10, (2): 599.

³² See Josef Semmler, "Lampert von Hersfeld und Giselbert von Hasungen" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 67 (1956): 261 for more information.

³³ Hagen Keller, "'Adelsheiliger' und Pauper Christi in Ekkeberts *Vita sancti Haimeradi*," in *Adel und Kirche*, ed. Josef Fleckenstein and Karl Schmid (Freiburg, 1968), p. 310. See Ekkebertus, (14): 602–603.

clerical marriage, for example, but it is a simple matter to gauge the beliefs of the author. Did all hermits, or even just Haimrad, receive such rough treatment? As one would expect in a propagandistic Gregorian text, the emphasis is on Haimrad's problems with Church authorities, covering over possible difficulties with the laity. The author is free in his criticisms of contemporary monasticism, arguing against a Church of the nobility, while the poor went without much instruction.³⁴ More important, Ekkebertus suggests throughout the *vita* that there are ways to monastic purity that can be carried on outside of the monastery, a theme that would have been very unusual in Haimrad's own lifetime.³⁵ The *vita* compares Haimrad to a sarabaite, one of an untried group of religious wanderers with no rule to hold them together. As we will see, this terminology became popular in the polemics of the Investiture Contest to criticize reformers. What is strange here is that the author, a pro-Gregorian Church reformer, used the term to *approve* of Haimrad's wandering and preaching.³⁶ The use of the word "sarabaite" suggests that Haimrad's hagiographer was involved in serving the ecclesiastical reform. The reactions against Haimrad certainly were strong for a monk who has done nothing worse than wander. Grundmann has argued that Haimrad got so little positive reaction from the bishops and abbots he encountered on his journey because he was born a serf,³⁷ but the *vita*, usually a quite detailed report, does not even hint at previous serfdom as a cause for his troubles on the road. Although when he met with the bishop of Paderborn his clothes were old and dirty, that surely was not an unusual state for an individual hermit. He was also obviously literate, and had either bought the books the bishop consigned to the flames (whatever sort of books they were) or a generous patron had provided them. There was no reason to identify Haimrad as a serf, or anything worse than a sarabaite or a gyrovague.

Although this *vita* is in some ways a better source for the papal reform movement than for information about the beginning of the eleventh century, some legends of the founder must have been accessible to the monks of Hasungen. I believe that Ekkebertus wrote

³⁴ Keller, "Adelsheiliger," p. 308.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 317.

³⁶ Ibid., 321.

³⁷ Grundmann, p. 322.

primarily to encourage other monks to leave their homes to preach the gospel and, while they were at it, touch on the iniquities of bishops and anyone who opposed Gregory VII. The Haimrad of the *vita* consistently opposes evil members of the secular clergy who try to keep him from the godly work of preaching. After all, as Ekkebertus says at the beginning of his account, the end of the world is nearing, so that even the lights of heaven seem to fade, and saints seem to be vanishing. Nevertheless, Haimrad, despite all the indignities and pain he suffered, was indeed a light to those who are in darkness.³⁸ The real Haimrad lived long enough to see the needs of the Church and to place them above all else, such as when he would not have dealings with the wife of a priest. So he was involved in reform of the greater Church, the only difference being that Haimrad's hagiographer could point to the specific fight against nicolaitism (clerical marriage), while simony does not appear in the story. The sentiments could well apply both to the real Haimrad and to this *vita*'s propaganda. I believe there are several reasons to accept the basic outline of the *Vita Haimeradi* as true. Gregorian activities, while present, are not the only reason Haimrad suffered.

Why should an author wish to write about these humiliations that Haimrad suffered? He had all the visible requirements for a hermit—he “crucified his flesh” and in general followed as many ascetic practices as his body could bear.³⁹ He appears to have made a profession of being kicked out of religious houses. It is not clear whether he made his monastic profession at Hersfeld, but one day when no one expected it, he prostrated himself at the daily chapter, and begged leave to depart. Haimrad, either because he was too honest or too stupid, told the assembled brethren that he wanted to leave because he saw no way to save his soul in that monastery. The abbot was angry and kicked Haimrad, then threw him out.⁴⁰ He made his way to Kirchberg, then, after being expelled, he went to the villa of Kirch-Detmold. There he quickly became well known, and word of his sanctity quickly spread. Unfortunately, that meant that Haimrad received gifts and offerings that would normally have gone to the area's own parish priest. He added insult to injury when the parish priest's wife came with an offering that Haimrad refused to accept unless

³⁸ Ekkebertus, (1-2): 599.

³⁹ Ekkebertus, (13): 602.

⁴⁰ Ibid., (7): 600.

she reformed her life, which puts him firmly in the camp of ecclesiastical reform. Of course the priest then turned against Haimrad, and after trying to injure Haimrad in several ways, had him driven away with dogs.⁴¹ Next he went to Paderborn. The bishop saw him, and asked where that devil had come from. (Haimrad was very poorly clothed and deformed by fasting.) According to the account, Haimrad responded humbly, rejoicing that he was a companion in the Lord's Passion. He explained that he was a priest. The bishop heard him sing mass, a common way to prove orthodoxy; still, he took Haimrad's books and had them thrown on the fire, and Haimrad himself received a flogging.⁴² After that experience Haimrad settled at Hasungen, which soon grew into a monastery, so he gained respectability and after his death was venerated as a saint.⁴³

We do not know the substance of most of Haimrad's preaching. It seems unlikely that it was unorthodox, considering Haimrad's peaceful latter years. But his works seem to have enraged many. What is more, he was not alone. Other wandering hermits described in the literature of the early eleventh century appear to have encountered difficulties at the hands of the hierarchy. We have already seen the suspicion with which Pilgrim of Passau encountered Wolfgang of Regensburg, in accounts that have clear parallels to that of Haimrad. Also, as we will see, pre-Gregorian hermits such as John Gualbert appear to have had difficulties when setting out independently from their monasteries. If the stories told in the *vita* are true, the account gives additional evidence that wandering preachers did exist, but were quite unpopular in Germany, at least among the Church hierarchy and in the newly Christianized central Europe. Although the *vita* did not appear until fifty years after Haimrad's death, one should not treat fraternal storytelling too lightly. Throughout this period and after, an intelligent bishop would have checked out any holy man preaching in his diocese before the preacher had even settled. The *vita* is Gregorian in its organization, but it also gives us an important and rare look at the wandering preachers of eleventh-century Germany acting on their own initiative, and sometimes at considerable personal risk. It also shows the root of wandering as being the fault

⁴¹ Ibid., (9): 601.

⁴² Ibid., (10): 601.

⁴³ Grundmann, "Eremiti," p. 322.

of a bishop or abbot who has failed to keep within the bounds of canon law.

Italy was a much safer place for hermits than were the German parts of the empire, and various regions were financially able to sponsor holy men. There must have been many independent hermits, since thirty-four of them made it into the ranks of the saints, as Penco has shown in a very interesting study of "irregular hermits" in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Although little contemporary evidence exists about most of them, Penco has suggested certain general characteristics in his analysis especially of eleventh-century hermits. These hermit-monks evinced interest in lay piety, had a tendency to promote women, and displayed marked evangelical and eschatological tendencies.⁴⁴ All of these traits, although exaggerated to suit the proper theme of virtuoso holiness, fit well into our picture of world-friendly religious appearing in increasing numbers at the turn of the millennium. Particularly noteworthy is that most of the thirty-four male hermits identified in Penco's study spent at least part of their lives as monks.⁴⁵ Were they escapees from a system that was too restrictive or complaisant for the zeal of these saintly hermits?

Any monk who took up an active role in the world had to deal with the horror of vagabondage the ecclesiastical authorities of the central middle ages felt. Early Church leaders had found that the troubles caused by hermits who visited cities to preach greatly outweighed the possible spiritual benefits of this uncontrolled force, preaching without permission, and often setting themselves up as spiritual experts in opposition to the bishops. The forces of law and order gradually won over those of religious enthusiasm, and were embodied in both ecclesiastical and imperial legislation.⁴⁶ These laws were adopted and reinforced in the Carolingian age.⁴⁷ As we have

⁴⁴ Gregorio Penco, "L'Eremitismo irregolare in Italia nei secoli XI-XII" *Benedictina* 32 (1985): 206.

⁴⁵ Penco, *passim*.

⁴⁶ The most important of these councils for monks was the Council of Chalcedon in 451. It in effect altered the nature of monasticism, at least in theory, by forbidding them a role in city debates and subordinating them firmly to their bishops. For more information, see Leo Ueding, "Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Aloys Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht, vol. 2 (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 569-676.

⁴⁷ Charles J. Hefele, *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*, trans. H. Leclercq (Paris, 1909), p. 390, for the pertinent Chalcedonian canon. Besides its appearance in capitularies, the canon has an important place in the Anianian monastic legislation. Josef Semmler, "Karl der Große und das fränkische Mönchtum," in *Karl der*

seen, popular opinion at least from the mid ninth century reinforced this legislation, emphasizing personal stability as a foundation for holiness. Thus, perhaps even more important for understanding the response authorities made toward active hermits in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries is that the very notion that a man could reach spiritual perfection while still wantonly seeking out contacts with the secular world starkly contradicted both Benedictine and reclusive religiosity. Monks who were drawn to such a calling had no choice but to leave the cloister and adopt a marginal existence on the fringes of accepted religious life.⁴⁸

v. Romuald of Ravenna and the Camaldolesi

Thanks to the fact that they had their own historians and hagiographers, it is to the new monastic foundations after the year 1000 that we must turn for our best information on this drive toward the world and the pressures placed on the men who engaged in such behavior. Of these, the best example is the early history of Camaldoli. Peter Damian, one of the few extant Camaldolese writers of the eleventh century, would have us believe that his congregation held firmly by a policy of absolute withdrawal from the world. But in his early *vita* of the founder Romuald of Ravenna, he gives a very different picture of the origins and goals of Camaldoli, a picture that diverges strongly from Damian's own view of the proper religious life and his Camaldolese-style community of Fonte Avellana. We have already seen how involved Romuald and several of his followers were in the evangelization of the pagan Slavs; side by side with this interest there existed a vigorous effort to preach moral reform to the populace of northern Italy.

A list of Romuald's ecclesiastical reforming efforts makes impressive reading. Peter Damian relates that Romuald was the first in

Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben, ed. Wolfgang Braunsfels, vol. 2 (Düsseldorf, 1965), pp. 263–66 gives a handy summary of Charlemagne's monastic legislation.

⁴⁸ Many monasteries had regularly organized hermitages near them, where monks could retreat for longer or shorter times, such as Cluny. See Jean Leclercq, "L'érémisme en Occident jusqu'à l'an mil," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 31–33; Leclercq, "Pierre le Vénérable et l'érémisme clunisien," in *Petrus Venerabilis*, ed. Giles Constable and James Kritzeck (*StAns* 40, Rome, 1956), pp. 102, 110; Etienne Delaruelle, "Les ermites et la spiritualité populaire," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, p. 213. Proper hermits, like monks, fled from contact with threatening influences.

Italy to take up the struggle against simony and nicolaitism. This may be an exaggeration, but it strongly suggests that Romuald's work in Church reform was visible to observers. In addition, he interested himself in the reform of canons regular, that odd hybrid of monk and secular priest.⁴⁹ The author of the customary of Farfa gives an even more fulsome account of Romuald's work for reform. The customary begins: "When Christ's precepts were annulled and turned as if to scorn through all of Italy, diabolical suggestions began to increase, and to be completed in deeds, so that even those in sacred orders took wives after the custom of laymen, and exercised without difficulty the heresy of simony. . . ." It was in the midst of this state of affairs, according to the author, that Romuald started a renewal of religious life, providing an example that Abbot Hugh of Farfa had begun to follow at the time of writing.⁵⁰

This interest in the reform of the entire Christian world was especially noteworthy because Romuald was by profession a monk under the Rule of Benedict, who chose this form of mission of his own free will. He had made his profession at St. Apollinare in Classe, but according to Damian's *vita* abandoned the community in disgust at the lifestyle of his fellow monks. His life thus followed a course that became common in the early eleventh century. Although a monk, he abandoned the cloister because his own views of the religious life failed to coincide with those of his brethren. He became, according to the language of the time, a gyrovague, a sarabitic monk like Haimrad. Romuald obtained additional instruction on the proper holy life from the hermit Marinus, after he had left his monastery, lessons that probably included many elements divorced from monasticism. In time Romuald gathered a circle of followers, attracted by his ascetic life or by his fiery crusade against simony, and thus gained respectability as the founder of Camaldoli and several other houses for his disciples. As an abbot, Romuald moved into a new sphere, in which travel and interference in lay affairs were not as irregular as they

⁴⁹ Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (35): 75-76; Walter, pp. 155-56. See also Brunetto Quilici, "Giovanni Gualberto e la sua riforma monastica" *Archivio storico italiano* 99,2 (1941): 31.

⁵⁰ "Dum per uniuersam Italiam Christi praecepta annullarentur et uelut in fastidio uersarentur, diabolicae suggestiones caeperunt augmentari et opere compleri, ita ut etiam in sacris constituti ordinibus sicut mos laicorum est uxores acciperent et sine aliqua difficultate heresim exercebant simoniacam." *Liber tramitis*, ed. Petrus Dinter, CCM 10 (1980), (1): 3. The customary was written sometime between 1015 and 1033. See p. lii.

were for a scruffy refugee from a monastery he had not liked. Thus, after he had begun his new career as eremitical-monastic founding father, he could be packaged safely and put into the hagiographical tradition without too much comment.

The traditional form of hagiographical writing employed by Romuald's hagiographer cannot completely disguise the radical nature of the first generation of Camaldolesi, however. Romuald certainly attracted followers who were interested in him above all because of his active stance toward the world. That we know of as many disciples involved in pagan mission as we do—Bruno of Querfurt; Benedict and John who were killed in Poland; and the seventeen unnamed disciples who also undertook the Slavic and Magyar mission, not counting seven who stayed with Romuald in his illness⁵¹—suggests that Romuald attracted many disciples who had a strong interest in an active life. It is so unusual to hear of *any* disciples of a monastic reformer that these references must give us pause. Also the places where he acquired disciples, at the imperial court or in the middle of preaching ventures, suggest that Romuald's activities in secular society were at least part of his own personal appeal. Even future generations of Camaldolesi could not disguise this, although they tried to show a pristine past by forgetting the much more radical goals of their forebears.

Romuald's ascetic life has been described as a "violent passage" from silence and contemplation to preaching.⁵² Yet the sense of wrenching dislocation between the active and contemplative lives is much more representative of Peter Damian's view of the world than that of his problematic role model. We know from his own writings that Peter felt torn between longing for solitude as a means of personal salvation and the manifest need of the Church for qualified workers. It appears likely that some of Damian's view worked its way into the *Vita Romualdi*. This is not to deny that a side of Romuald appears to have longed for a quiet life of retreat from the concerns of the world. We know from another source, Bruno of Querfurt, that Romuald's brief rule to his disciples included Jerome's advice to ascetics: "sit in your cell as if in paradise."⁵³ Romuald also encouraged

⁵¹ See above, chapter two.

⁵² Giovanni Tabacco, "Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell'eremitismo Camaldolese," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, p. 81.

⁵³ "sede in cella quasi in paradiso." Bruno Querfurtensi, *Vita quinque fratrum*, MPH series nova, 4,3 (1973), (22): 83. Cf. Jerome ep. 125, c. 7, CSEL 54, p. 125.

reclusion among his disciples, and spent extended periods as a recluse himself, escaping from his own followers for periods of solitude.⁵⁴ The periods of retreat are thus a part of Romuald. Yet as soon as Romuald was no longer a catalyst, living alone and in silence for the last several years before his death in 1027, Camaldoli became much more controllable by the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and conformed to standard practices. An early charter for Camaldoli, dating from the same year their founder died, stresses the solitude and contemplative life that the hermits ought to enjoy without disturbance.⁵⁵ What was missing in most of his followers is the active side to his character.

Maybe, as Sydow has suggested, Romuald forced himself into an active role as a preacher since he felt he should exercise a God-given skill, though he really longed for solitude.⁵⁶ But the most vehement statements of Romuald's longing for solitude all come from the pen of Peter Damian, surely at least as biased a source as Bruno of Querfurt, although on the opposite side of the fence when it came to monastic activity in the world. Even Damian could not completely leave out his subject's active life. According to Peter, God's grace had made Romuald a teacher—he calls him “master” and “doctor”—so since God had granted him the gift of teaching, Romuald had no choice but to exercise it.⁵⁷ It is impossible to disentangle Romuald and Peter. At the very least, Peter's *vita* shows that Romuald was active in the world. As Damian saw the matter, Romuald must have experienced a deep inner conflict between longing for solitude and a sense of duty to care for others:

[Romuald] deliberated within himself whether he ought to completely lay aside care for others and concern himself only with his own salvation. But after he had this thought, a great terror filled his entire soul that, if he persisted firmly in what his mind had conceived, he could not doubt that he would be lost and damned by divine judgment.

Romuald decided that this tempting thought was yet another ploy of the devil to keep him from his proper care for others.⁵⁸ In this world

⁵⁴ See Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (52): 94. He also retreated from the world for the last few years of his life. (69): 111. Jürgen Sydow, “Probleme der camaldulensischen Ostmission,” in *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*, ed. Helmut Beumann (Darmstadt, 1963), p. 111.

⁵⁵ Document of Bishop Theodald of Arezzo of 1027, cited by Kurze, pp. 7–8.

⁵⁶ See Sydow, pp. 149–51.

⁵⁷ See Jean Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église* (Rome, 1960), p. 30.

⁵⁸ “hoc apud semetipsum deliberat, ut iam de caetero sua contentus, alienae salutis

view, no individual salvation was possible without concern for others, but such care for others was a horrible sacrifice for the monk, who wanted nothing more than silence and withdrawal. At least that is what we are meant to believe. Such a view leaves intact the notion of monks seeking solitude, since their activity in the world is proper only because they have been compelled to action. But Romuald was ready and able to take on any work that needed doing.

For Romuald, retreat from the world was always for "periods." He alternated times of contemplation and action, going away periodically to recoup his spiritual energies. None of the extant contemporary sources show Romuald dragged from solitude because of grievous emergencies, like a second Cincinnatus called from his plow. Indeed, except for Peter Damian's witness, one would not suppose any sort of tension at all. The pattern of Romuald's behavior seems best to fit, not traditional Benedictine religiosity in its retreat from pollution in the world, but the more mixed life presented by Gregory the Great as an ideal for the spiritual life of bishops, who cannot and should not avoid contact with the world around them. Romuald's vitality while in the world came from his times of quiet contemplation; his contemplation gave him a strong spiritual foundation for missionary work, the early fight against simony, and his role as counselor and spiritual mentor.

This Gregorian model would be perfectly acceptable for a bishop or lesser member of the secular clergy, but not for a monk. If Romuald did indeed accept alternating periods of action and contemplation as his natural and acceptable religious position, he was moving out of the typical Benedictine religiosity of his day, although periods of retreat were an accepted part of the religious life of the time. Nevertheless, despite his radical notions and atypical life, it appears that he saw himself as a monk, in this period in the West synonymous with a follower of the Benedictine Rule. Romuald's ascetic and active movement developed in a basically Benedictine religious world. He did not try to abandon the traditions of Benedictine monasticism as he understood them. On the contrary, Romualdian communities were

curam omnino postponat. Postquam videlicet cogitationem tantus animum eius terror invasit ut, si in eo quod mente conceperat obstinate persisteret, perituum se damnumque divino iudicio nullatenus dubitaret." Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (19): 43-44; cf. (17): 41 for another case of demonic temptation. See Hans Peter Laqua, *Traditionen und Leitbilder bei dem Ravennater Reformator Petrus Damiani 1042-1052* (Munich, 1976), pp. 103-104 for a discussion of this passage.

profoundly rooted in the Benedictine Rule, as Peter Damian emphasized. The conservative Cluniac practice, visible especially in their customaries,⁵⁹ was especially present in Romuald's work. Differences between Romualdian monasteries and those of the Benedictine, Cluniac tradition were mostly more superficial than fundamental.⁶⁰ After all, Romuald's religious education before he became a hermit was as a monk of St. Apollinare in Classe near Ravenna, and he also spent time at the monastery of Cusa.⁶¹ The only difference that stands out is Romuald's, and especially his disciples', level of activity in the world.

Although Romuald may have thought of himself as a Benedictine, and it was in Damian's interests to depict him as such, such a designation stretched the bounds of credibility for the monastic world of the early eleventh century. Romuald left St. Apollinare to become a hermit, an action that led to a real possibility of conflict with ecclesiastical authorities. After all, the only commonly accepted standard by which to judge religious life of any sort was the Benedictine Rule. Not surprisingly, when Romuald left his monastery, becoming an "exile," he soon ran into problems with the local bishop, who tested him to see that he was not a gyrovague, as Wolfgang of Regensburg had been tested during his self-imposed mission to the Magyars, and Haimrad had been tested by an unsympathetic bishop.⁶² Romuald and the bishop were defining religious life in very different ways, and this bishop, like his colleagues in the other cases, was extremely suspicious of any wandering monk.

Romualdian spirituality appears to have been both more open toward the world in terms of giving aid and advice and more severe in its renunciation of many elements of secular life.⁶³ This is true to the form of wayward monks like Romuald; they passed freely back and forth between the active and contemplative lives. It was from

⁵⁹ This is most obvious in the *Liber tramitis*, a second-hand account of the customs of Cluny at the time of Abbot Odilo, received at Farfa via the Romualdian monastery of Mons Opuli that had sent a monk to Cluny to get it. See p. xxiv. The customary begins with praise of Romuald, strongly suggesting that these elaborate conditions for travel, clothing, oblation, etc., were not considered in conflict with Romuald's teaching.

⁶⁰ Bernard Hamilton, "S. Pierre Damien et les mouvements monastiques de son temps" *StGreg* 10 (1975): 185, 188; Walter, p. 153.

⁶¹ Petrus Damiani, *Vita Romualdi*, (2): 19; Walter, pp. 56, 63.

⁶² Jean Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale* (Paris, 1964), pp. 66–67.

⁶³ Tabacco, "Romualdo di Ravenna," p. 102.

the ranks of the religious zealots that active monks like Romuald emerged. The two elements of life, asceticism and action in the world, seemed to support each other. For Romuald and some others of the early Camaldolesi, it was his asceticism that obligated him to take up the role of preacher. Asceticism, long periods of contemplative prayer accompanied by deprivation and discipline, formed a closer link to God than that experienced by ordinary men, or even ordinary monks. In this sense, they were taking upon themselves the spiritual power of recluses but without their stability. The lifestyle of the early Camaldolesi certainly set them off as a religious elite, recognized as such both by themselves and by their admirers outside of the hermitage.

We have reached a stage of belief that the true ascetic was in a position of moral superiority and obligation; since he knew God's will more clearly than did others, he must spread the word to the rest of the world. This belief could sum up this book. The more ascetic monks became, the more some of them became aware that they had gifts to offer to a spiritually needy world. While trying to follow the strictures of the Benedictine Rule, they were impatient with much of the customary behavior that had become attached to it. In a yet greater revolution, although they venerated the Rule, they looked also at other sources for their religious lives, especially those that encouraged an active life for men of God.

Traditional black monks of course cared for the well-being of their fellow men still in the world. The tendency was, however, to focus on prayer for the mass of secular society, and on the conversion of a few worthy individuals to the monastic life. Romuald too wanted to convert others to his way of life: Peter Damian tells that his ardent desire was "that he might make the whole world a hermitage or convert them [the laity] to the monastic order and save the whole multitude of the populace."⁶⁴ Conversion of the whole world, however, is a very different matter from winning over a few elect souls. It was perhaps an impossible goal, but the founder of Camaldoli did not limit himself to dreams of a perfect, monastic world. He also preached moral reform and clerical reform, practical steps to an improved Christian society for everyone.

Where did this fascination with preaching come from? Two main

⁶⁴ "Adeo ut putaretur totum mundum in heremum velle conuertere et monachico ordini omnem populi multitudinem sotiare." Peter Damian, *Vita Romualdi*, (37): 78.

areas of change helped lead to the driving interest in saving Christian society exhibited by Romuald and some of his contemporaries. The first has already been discussed in some detail: Romuald was moved by a missionary interest radiating from the rapidly changing eastern frontier of the German Empire and the newly forming Slavic and Magyar kingdoms. According to Peter Damian's *vita*, Romuald's highest goal was mission, motivated by hope for the crown of martyrdom.⁶⁵ Romuald was on very good terms with several Saxons, including Bruno of Querfurt and Emperor Otto III. After Adalbert of Prague's death, Otto's piety came to converge with Romuald's asceticism to create a much greater mission program than considered before. It aimed toward the salvation of all souls, rather than limiting intervention in the secular world to Romuald's recruiting efforts for his newly founded monasteries. In penance for a massacre he had ordered in Rome, Otto promised to become a hermit and work to convert the Slavs. The decision to go out and evangelize the pagans did not originate with Romuald; Bruno of Querfurt expressed surprise that the eremitical leader should have agreed so swiftly to the plan.⁶⁶ Tabacco has suggested that the successes and failures of Romuald's own monks evolved into a new concept of monasticism as the vehicle of salvation for all.⁶⁷ One can find corroborating evidence for this in the chronology of Romuald's life. Only during his friendship with Otto and after the latter's death did Romuald come to the fore as a leader in preaching ecclesiastical reform, the purification of all Christians, rather than restoring monasteries and making sure they stuck to their new laws.

The other great model that has been pointed to as an influence on Romuald's active role as preacher to secular society was that of the Fathers of the Egyptian desert. St. Antony of the Desert was a particularly important model in the eleventh century, especially in Italy.⁶⁸ The eleventh-century hermits-monks identified themselves more clearly than had tenth-century monks with the early hermits of the

⁶⁵ See Fridolin Dressler, *Petrus Damiani. Leben und Werk* (*StAns* 34, Rome, 1954), p. 26.

⁶⁶ See Reinhard Wenskus, *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt* (Münster/Cologne, 1956), p. 134.

⁶⁷ Tabacco, "Romualdo di Ravenna," pp. 91–92.

⁶⁸ Jean Leclercq, "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médiévale," in *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356–1956*, ed. Basilius Steidle (*StAns* 38, Rome, 1956), p. 235; for the importance of Antony as a model to Romuald, see Tabacco, "Romualdo di Ravenna," p. 93.

desert, and tried to live according to their inspiration. Romuald has also been credited as the first hermit of his age to live according to the norms described in the *Sayings of the Fathers*.⁶⁹ Romuald tried, with a fair degree of success, to blend traditional Benedictine forms with the way of life described in these works. The parallels between early eremitism and that of the eleventh century are clear. Early accounts of the desert fathers show them alternating between periods of complete retreat from the world and a high degree of involvement in spreading Christianity and Christian notions of morality to a population that was still ill-educated and barely Christian by educated standards. They displayed a high degree of independence and an active concern for Christian society, and for the conversion of pagans.

The ascetic tradition to which Romuald had been born had mostly turned against the active life portrayed in these early accounts, but it was this model that seemed both compelling and effective for at least some groups in the eleventh century. For indeed the question is not where Romuald got his ideas, but why texts that had been read in monasteries for centuries should have attracted more interest in the eleventh century than at any time before. Perhaps their sudden popularity was a conscious response to a search for an authoritative alternative to tradition-encrusted Benedictinism. Not all monks who were interested in the troubles of the world turned to the desert fathers for inspiration, at least in a manner we can identify from the available sources. This was a movement without a common source, the members of which were often unaware of the existence of like-minded people in other regions, so it is natural that there be no simple answer to the question of the origin of their ideas.

As Bosl has argued, eleventh-century eremitism shows elements of the religiosity not just of monks but of the newly popular canons regular, who set out to live communally and according to a rule, but were at the same time members of the secular clergy with religious duties especially toward the laity. He sees eremitism as a form of pastoral care in transition between these two religious worlds.⁷⁰ Elements

⁶⁹ See Delaruelle, "Les ermites," p. 214.

⁷⁰ See Karl Bosl, *Regularkanoniker (Augustinerchorherren) und Seelsorge in Kirche und Gesellschaft des europäischen 12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1979), foreword. Stefan Weinfurter in "Bemerkungen und Corrigenda zu Karl Bosl's 'Regularkanoniker und Seelsorge'" in *AfKG* 62/63 (1980/1): 381–95 suggests that Bosl should have put greater emphasis on the eleventh-century eremitical roots of the canon regular movement.

of both do show up clearly for the early Camaldolesi. With our gift of hindsight we can indeed see these hermits as proto-cans. But to their contemporaries they must have appeared more often as monks who acted strangely and inappropriately. Their activities in the world challenged the parameters of Benedictine ways of thought. They managed to maintain their identity as monks despite the rise of cans regular because the Benedictine Rule was still far more popular than all other rules. Still, in the process the hermits, especially the independent ones who wandered from town to town, prepared the way for new groups like the cans regular to break free from Benedictine tradition. New regulations were added as necessary to govern hermits, since Benedict's Rule was, by its own admission, a rule for beginners, and hermits were more spiritually advanced. The work of the cans definitely helped shape the attitudes of the early eleventh century.

vi. *Monks and caritas*

The active role of radical monks focuses very quickly on the issues of simony and clerical marriage, the two keystones of the ecclesiastical reform party that were taken over by a much more active papacy after 1046 and the synods of Sutri and Rome. Reform of the world thus became a political issue as well as a moral one, further complicating the picture for monks who were wary of secular involvements.

While the early tenth-century Odo of Cluny had written that it is necessary to speak out against sin, going so far as to anticipate one of the reforming pope Gregory VII's favorite scriptural passages—"cursed is he who withholds his sword from blood" (Jer 48.10)—he meant his exhortation for fellow monks, not for the laity.⁷¹ Nevertheless, using the anti-world attitudes prevailing in early Cluniac writing as a starting point, one can see gradual shifts in attitude. This is especially plain in cases where the meaning of a word or of a scriptural passage alters over time. This is an area of study that provides valuable, sometimes crucial, evidence in a century of scarce sources. One particularly surprising gap in the scholarship lies in total indiffer-

⁷¹ Odo Cluniacensis, *Collationes*, (II.17): 563. Heinrich Fichtenau points out the popularity of this passage for Gregory VII in "Cluny und der Mönch Hildebrand (Gregor VII)," in his *Beiträge zur Mediävistik*, vol. 3, p. 146.

ence to the shift in the meaning of *caritas*, brotherly love, and its accompanying virtue of love of neighbor. In the early tenth century, despite its important appearances in the New Testament, most notably in 1 Corinthians 13, and in some early Christian works, the expression *caritas* found little resonance in monastic writing, following a tradition of centuries. Love of God was assumed and stressed, but most *vitae* speak only of love of God. Few address the issue of love of neighbor. Mentions of the precept to love God and neighbor are extremely rare. For example, Liudger's *vita* of Gregory of Utrecht, written shortly after 786, refers to it in passing.⁷² Candidus' *Vita Eigilis*, written sometime before 840, is somewhat more revealing of the attitudes of traditional Benedictines. In it, the emperor Louis the Pious is made to remind the monks of Fulda to love God and neighbor, as well as the Benedictine Rule. Rather than continuing with the theme of loving God and neighbor, though, Louis goes on to exhort them to monastic discipline and to keep peace among themselves "without avarice."⁷³ In other words, *caritas* appears to have been seriously considered as an intraclaustral virtue to the monks who read and the authors who wrote these *vitae*, since no layman or woman is ever mentioned as receiving benefits from a monastery, although this certainly happened.

An early ninth-century treatise on the monastic life, Smaragdus of St. Mihiel's *Diadema monachorum*, also includes a section on brotherly love. Smaragdus, often useful as a guide to commonly held beliefs in the Carolingian period, does not spend much time on this issue. When he does, "neighbor" appears again to be equivalent to "fellow monk." There is no acknowledgment that monks may have dealings with others outside of the cloister. He copies a few passages from both Scripture and the Fathers of the Church on the subject of *caritas*, but does not personalize them to apply to contemporary monks. It is clear, though, that he envisions *caritas* as an issue between monks, rather than a matter involving the outside world.⁷⁴

This attitude does not change significantly in the monastic literature of the early tenth century. When it does change, the shift occurs first within monasteries of the Germanic Empire, rather than at monasteries

⁷² Liudger, *Vita Gregorii abbatis Traiectensis*, MGH SS 15,1, (prologus): 66.

⁷³ "Cura ergo disciplinae monachorum perfecta dilectio est, haec vinculum caritatis et pacis exhortatio, sine avaritia." Candidus, *Vita Eigilis abbatis Fuldenses*, MGH SS 15,1, (9): 226.

⁷⁴ Smaragdus abbas s. Michaelis, *Diadema monachorum*, PL 102, (4): 598-601.

associated with the highly conservative Cluny. This may be wronging Cluny, since we have long introspective treatises from the pen of its second abbot, while for the Lotharingian Gorzian reform we have to rely on hagiography rather than treatises. A Gorzian of the first generation may indeed have taken a stand similar to that of the earliest Cluniacs—we simply do not know.

Odo of Cluny in his *Collationes* shows clearly that at least in his monastic understanding the need to interpret *caritas* in some way has not changed. Early in this treatise on monastic spirituality the abbot of Cluny does point out that it is necessary to care for one's neighbors—the Christian faith is negated without it, and as one of Jesus' central precepts in the gospels a Christian cannot ignore its importance. Odo deals in quite general universal terms, however. He recognizes that Jesus became flesh out of brotherly love, *caritas*, but does not elaborate on this image to urge any duty on his monks toward those outside of the cloister.⁷⁵ Although Christ may have been full of brotherly love, monks are not asked to imitate that aspect of his life, or at least were expected to limit this imitation to fellow monks and to pray for a laity with whom few monks had significant contact. As in the case of the apostles, Jesus can be admired, but is too far above human comprehension to emulate.

Overall, the issue of love of neighbor simply does not attract Odo's interest. This is most striking when he makes a point using the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10. 30–37). Although in the gospel account the whole purpose of this parable is to answer the question "who is my neighbor," Odo had a completely different purpose in mind for this tale. For him, the deepest significance of the story lies in the Jew whom the thieves robbed and beat. If he had not been away from home, the robbers would not have attacked the unfortunate man in the first place. In other words, the story is a lesson that monks should not go out of their cloisters into the big and evil world.⁷⁶ Love of neighbor plays no role here.

The period from the late tenth century through the eleventh century saw, as medievalists have generally recognized, a basic shift toward a more affective Christian piety, and more common expressions of brotherly love among monks reflect that shift. Monks in their writings began to refer to each other in terms of love. Hagiographical

⁷⁵ Odo, *Collationes*, (I.18): 531.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, (I.31): 541.

sources more frequently listed *caritas* as a desirable virtue for saints, although usually without explanation of what the author means by such a term. One can also find occasional references to brotherly love among equal monks, rather than descriptions including *caritas* as a virtue of abbots who take care of their flocks. Froumund, for example, a monk of Tegernsee writing shortly after the turn of the millennium, describes his feelings toward his former monastery in terms of love. In a letter to a friend, known only as "G," he says that he has indeed left this former comrade and their common monastery, but only in body, not in spirit, since their minds continue to be joined in love.⁷⁷ Similarly, the monk-missionary Bruno of Querfurt tells of his parting from his friend Benedict in an extremely moving passage, in which Benedict, speaking with the voice of prophecy, recognizes Bruno in love (*karitate*) as a future bishop.⁷⁸ The bonds of *caritas* between the brethren of the same house are more recognized and lauded in the eleventh century. Thus, for example, in his final letter to his disciples before his death, John Gualbert, the founder of the monastic and ecclesiastical reform congregation of Vallombrosa, told his followers to love one another. He specifically urges brotherly love, *caritas*, above all.⁷⁹ It is possible to see in scattered sources from the eleventh century the first stirring of a newly affective monastic piety that would in the next century capture the imagination of several reforming groups, including especially the monks of Cîteaux.

This was not all that there was to *caritas*. The last two examples cited point to a significant element of the increased interest in this term: it was especially employed by precisely those monks who form the basis of this study, who wanted to lead more active lives in the world. *Caritas* is the enabling virtue that draws monks from the traditional Benedictine life into a wider world. *Caritas* is invoked as the justification of behavior that is considered un-monastic, especially activity that takes monks out of the monastery. The ways in which the term is used, especially in hagiographical sources, suggest that the authors were fully aware that they were describing a phenomenon about which their public was sensitive. They knew that, without a special education in the Christian values that underlay a stance

⁷⁷ *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, MGH Epist. Selectae 3, (I. #6), p. 8.

⁷⁸ Bruno Querfurtensi, *Vita quinque fratrum*, (4): 39.

⁷⁹ Andreas Strumensi, *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*, MGH SS 30,2, (80): 1101; Atto, *Vita s. Joannis Gualberti*, PL 146, (71): 700.

of activity toward the world, many people would object to the role these monks were taking, whether as missionaries or among fellow Christians. *Caritas* was thus the theological justification for innovations that left monks open to criticism.⁸⁰

Caritas was the explanation for a variety of unmonastic behaviors, not always specifically reform-oriented, but always showing an apparent disregard for the accepted interpretations of the Benedictine Rule. One of the hagiographers of St. Kaddroe, an Irishman who resettled in Germany in the middle years of the tenth century, presented a quite simple image of *caritas* as more important than strict adherence to the Benedictine Rule. He tells how Kaddroe got his friend, the reforming abbot John of Gorze, to eat meat when he was sick (a dish normally forbidden to monks). Out of *caritas*, we are told, the Irish saint ate some himself.⁸¹ Another story about Kaddroe, written shortly after his death in c. 975 by the monk Reimmanus, further expands the notion of brotherly love. He tells how the laity of both sexes visited Kaddroe. This holy abbot, "as though he was sown in the fields by the Lord in *caritas*," gave them vivifying words and spiritual counsel.⁸² The image of God spreading holy men out in the world as freely as a farmer sows his seed gives an interesting picture of a beneficent God who is trying to grow a good crop for salvation. This example is also a good illustration of how abbots preceded monks in the path toward service in the world. This instance comes surprisingly early. In German hagiography before this time, there are few cases in which many laymen, or especially laywomen, came regularly to a monk, even an abbot, for advice. More normal is a case like that described by John of St. Arnulf's in Metz in his *vita* of John of Gorze. He paints numerous pictures of how John and his fellows

⁸⁰ Caroline Walker Bynum places this shift in spirituality in the twelfth century rather than in the eleventh, and finds it expressed especially among canons regular rather than monks. I believe she has been led to this conclusion in part by the nature of her sources, which do not include hagiographical literature. Her findings, though, also support my argument that men seeking a profession that emphasized *caritas* and teaching of others tended to gravitate to one of the new communities that not only permitted but encouraged these practices. See "The Spirituality of Regular Canons in the Twelfth Century," in *Jesus as Mother* (Berkeley, 1982), especially pp. 36–46. See also Bynum's *Docere verbo et exemplo* (Missoula, Montana, 1979), passim for a more comprehensive statement of her views.

⁸¹ *Vita Kaddroe abbatis Walciodorensis*, MGH SS 15,2, (30): 692.

⁸² "Visitabatur indies a civibus, accurrebant viri cum mulieribus quibus ille, ut erat Domino diffusus caritate, verba vitae, consilium animarum studebat impertiri." Reimannus, sive Ousmannus, *Vita Cadroe abbate*, AASS Mart. I, (25): 477.

avoided as far as possible all contact with the lay world. He even goes so far as to describe John mourning his lost purity when his position as cellarer of the monastery forced him to engage in conversation with laypeople.⁸³

One can see from the example of Kaddroe that *caritas* could be used to justify the broadening horizons of at least some monks. This is not to say that no Benedictines had given religious advice to the laity before, but only that, where an earlier hagiographer would have mentioned this role without comment, a late tenth-century hagiographer feels compelled to justify it. He does not simply take his hero's role as spiritual director for granted, but emphasizes the combination of divine and brotherly love that made such a role desirable.

The case of spiritual direction is a mild one. With the involvement of more monks in worldly affairs, *caritas* was even used as a principle to defend activities totally unheard-of for monks. Thus the historian Raoul Glaber, who wrote his *Histories* between 1044 and 1049, expresses *caritas* in terms that show the strong reforming influence to which Raoul had been exposed in his own life, especially as a disciple of the active William of Dijon. Raoul went so far as to invoke the ideal of *caritas* to argue that participation of monks in war is allowable. He tells how some monks were killed by Saracens who attacked under the leadership of al-Mansur in the late tenth century: they had done well, although normally monks should not bear arms, since they were moved more by fraternal love than by any desire for praise or glory.⁸⁴ Fraternal love here appears to mean love for any fellow Christians, rather than care of fellow monks. Obviously *caritas* could be used as justification for even the most radical positions. Most monks, no matter how concerned with lay matters, did not go to the extreme of taking up arms for their cause.

It is plain, though, that different biblical texts were coming into prominence and were being used to justify unusual actions. *Caritas*, whether between brethren in a monastery or toward Christian society as a whole, was becoming a dominant element in religious ideology, as parts of the Benedictine community read gospel injunctions to love and combined them with a shifted emphasis on Christ's love for his Church to create a serious but puzzling religious crisis. Attitudes

⁸³ Iohannes s. Arnulfi, (86): 361.

⁸⁴ Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum*, (II.18): 82; see Georges Duby, *The Three Orders* (Chicago, 1980), p. 196.

were shifting on the meaning of this elusive "love of neighbor." As Rather of Verona, writing in the mid tenth century, reminded his readers: "the love of God is never inactive; if it has renounced action . . . it is not love."⁸⁵ *Caritas* becomes a part of the ecclesiastical reform both for monks and laypeople. References to it become almost inevitable by the mid eleventh century. Yet the *caritas* advertised or used in defense of an action went far beyond a warm feeling for fellows in the cloister, to a notion of making others into neighbors by leading them into a Christian life.

The power of *caritas* to explain a desire to help people in the world is apparent in the way favorable hagiographers describe the missionary work that provides the earliest evidence of the monastic transition. Recall that, when Arnold of St. Emmeram writes about Wolfgang of Regensburg, he tells how the missionary "deserting the monastery but not the monastic state, and desiring to the depths of his soul to emulate the greater spiritual grace according to the Apostle" (1 Cor 12.31), went from Germany as an exile into Pannonia."⁸⁶ Central to this passage is a direct reference to Paul's statement that *caritas* is the "better way" to a truly Christian life. And *caritas* does not mean staying home and loving one's fellow monks. Rather, the command of brotherly love, as Arnold developed it in this defense of Wolfgang, is an evangelizing command, forcing Wolfgang to abandon the peace and quiet of the cloister for a wider field of action.

Earlier, shortly after the year 1000, the hagiographer Bruno of Querfurt described the Camaldolese hermits who were martyred while doing missionary work in Poland in terms of *caritas*. He singles out the hermit Benedict for praise, telling how he "loved God and his neighbor with a greater *caritas* than did his brethren."⁸⁷ From the context, clearly for Bruno "neighbors" included not only other monks

⁸⁵ "Nunquam est Dei amor otiosus; . . . si vero operari renuit, amor non est." PL 136: 471; cited in Friedrich Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis des Ruotger* (Bonn, 1958), p. 57; this letter can also be found in Raterius Veronensis, *Opera minora*, CCCM 46, p. 29 as "De translatione s. Metronis."

⁸⁶ "Cuius rei gratia monasterium et non monachum deserens, immo secundum apostolum maiora aemulari carismata cupiens, per Alamanniam devenit exul in Noricum." Arnoldus de s. Emmerammo, *Ex libris de s. Emmerammo duo*, MGH SS 4, (II.1): 556. This passage is used almost word for word by Othloh of St. Emmeram in his *Vita s. Wolfkangi*, (13): 530.

⁸⁷ "maiore caritate Deum dilexit et proximum." Bruno Querfurtensi, *Vita quinque fratrum*, (32): 83.

but all people, even the pagan Poles who eventually murdered Benedict and his companions.

I have found one other account, written somewhat later, that deals with mission to pagans as a form of brotherly love. This is Sigebert of Gembloux' *vita* of Guibert, written sometime between 1060 and 1070. Sigebert was one of the most active preachers *against* the papal/ecclesiastical reforms, and his attitude toward the nature of these new reforms reveals some of his underlying psychology. He tells of the monk Guibert's encounter with Hungarian raiders in 954. The invaders passed through Gembloux, the site of Guibert's community, from which everyone but Guibert had fled. This monk, as Sigebert explained the event, was "prepared to drink the chalice of suffering, and to lay down his life for the lives of his brothers, than which, as Truth [Jesus] says, there is no greater *caritas*." Sigebert goes on to tell how his hero preached to the Magyars, and converted many.⁸⁸ The description of course harks back to the gospel passage: "greater love has no man than this, that he should give his life for his friends" (Jn 15.13). Note that Sigebert has changed the "friend" of John's gospel to "brother," which seems to imply a limit upon the concept to the monastery instead of the wider world. Still, the main beneficiaries in this scene are of course the Magyars, who, thanks to Guibert's *caritas*, have won the possibility of eternal life.

The case of the hagiographer Sigebert illustrates the wide range of people influenced by these ideas of action in the world, at least to the point of accepting an action like mission when undertaken by another monk. For it was not necessary to be a member of a "re-forming" congregation or a proponent of the papal reform movement to be touched by this broader image of monastic responsibilities in the world. Sigebert supported the imperial side in the Investiture Contest and probably would have been quick to condemn groups like the Hirsauer with their campaign of preaching and agitation, one of the paths that a commitment to action eventually took, because of *caritas*, of course. But at least he was still willing to make exceptions to the norms of Benedictine behavior, as with Guibert. Sigebert also used efforts similar to those of his more radical brethren to justify preaching activity in the world—again suggesting that

⁸⁸ "paratus bibere calicem passionis, et ponere animam suam propter salvandas fratrum animas, qua, ut dicit veritas, non est maior caritas." Sigebertus Gemblacensis, *Vita Wicberti*, (14): 514.

he was aware that Guibert's mission could be criticized as improper for a monk, even though he stayed on home territory.

The accusation of impropriety in monastic behavior was one of the greatest stumbling blocks that would-be ecclesiastical reformers had to face. One of the most difficult complaints for monks to answer when they were involved with worldly affairs, whether preaching moral reform or exhorting bishops to the reform of the Church, stemmed from the longstanding belief that, like recluses, monks were formally dead to the world. The monastic profession was a second sacrament of baptism, moving the monk to a different plane of existence from the laity or secular clergy. The monk should have his eyes turned firmly toward God, not on the squalid life he has left for good.⁸⁹ John of Gorze in his book about the miracles of St. Gorgonius, the patron of Gorze, tells of a brother who fled from Gorze, taking the monastery's best horse with him. He returned, either because of divine inspiration or need, as the hagiographer states it. The fugitive was received back despite the misgivings of the monks, and carried a burden of broken vows along with the disapprobation of the other monks, who did not treat him with understanding. Before long, this anonymous monk fell back into his earlier evil ways (the only evil ever mentioned in the *vita* is that of leaving the monastery). While planning an escape, he saw a vision from which he learned that he could not flee and remain unpunished. God had his revenge. It is hardly surprising that this unwilling monk, probably torn between his monastic vocation and freedom to choose his own ways, all under the stark disapproval of his brethren, soon fell ill. He confessed on his deathbed that he had planned a second escape.⁹⁰ This was doubtless meant to edify monks on their yearly feast day in their patron's honor. It had the propaganda angle of linking warnings about punishment with a thoroughly unpleasant God who knows our thoughts. This is particularly common in monastic writings in the Empire in the tenth century.⁹¹

Monks who wished to speak out for reform were well aware of this attitude, and were not slow in finding a way to counter it. The very first entry in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica's* three folio vol-

⁸⁹ See Petrus Damiani, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damianis*, MGH Briefe #153, especially 4: 370.

⁹⁰ Johannes Gorziensis, *Miracula s. Gorgonii*, MGH SS 4, (19): 244–45.

⁹¹ See especially Hans Martin Klinkenberg, "Versuche und Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie bei Rather von Verona" *AfKG* 38 (1956): 305–309.

ume collection of the polemics of the Investiture Contest faces the issue head on. This letter, written by the monk Guido of Arezzo to a bishop sometime in the period 1023–1033, castigates the latter for his simony. As Guido says in the letter, he recognizes the impropriety that he, a dead man (i.e., a monk), should have the temerity to criticize a bishop. Nevertheless, that does not deter him. In this time of transformations of all estates, anyone—monk, priest, or layperson—who sees his brother doing evil and does not prevent or at least admonish him is as guilty as he is and will be damned.⁹² In other words, he speaks not as a monk, but as a Christian. Soon other voices joined his, and this became a standard refrain of the monks who became active in the ecclesiastical reform and their defenders. In this manner wayward and bothersome monks laid the foundation for the papal reform movement of the later eleventh century, long before the restored papacy had put itself at the head of the ecclesiastical reform movement. Thus when the papacy found a serious cause for concern in simony and nicolaitism (and papal rights), there was already a framework to convey the ideas of reform to the humbler members of the Christian society.

⁹² "Widonis monachi epistola ad Heribertum archiepiscopum," MGH LL 1: 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE "NEW MONASTICISM" OF LOTHARINGIA IN THE EARLY ELEVENTH CENTURY

The monastic reforms based on centers such as Gorze, Brogne, and Cluny made it very likely that, by the end of the tenth century, the typical monk in Germany and the members of reformed houses in France, England, and Italy led at least an outwardly pious existence. That is to say, the extant sources do not speak of concubinage or private property held by monks. The monks prayed at the regular canonical hours, and, as we have seen, increasing numbers were ordained as priests, so the singing of mass had plainly moved into a more central role in monastic spirituality. What is more, the monks seem on the whole to have been physically stable. Restriction to the cloister was a central tenet for tenth-century reformers, and we have seen how monastic custom limited even casual contact with the laity. In short, such monks were accepting as a matter of course standards of observance that would have reflected exceptional holiness in earlier centuries. The monastery as a prayer machine had been perfected.

A perversity often seems to run through the religious history of the middle ages. Repeatedly, no sooner does society perfect its religious elite than the laity undermine the very aspects of professional religious life they most praise. Thus, in probably the most famous example, in the twelfth century the Cistercians won a great reputation for holiness based especially on their institutional poverty and determination to withdraw from the norms of feudal society, especially by performing their own manual labor. The laity and secular clergy were so impressed that they loaded the Cistercians with gifts and lands, helping significantly to undermine the foundations of a distinct Cistercian piety in the process.¹ Similarly, the mendicant orders of the thirteenth century received praise from many especially for their distinctive poverty—and their pious lay admirers hurried to heap

¹ This is a thread that runs throughout the first century of Cistercian history. For a general history of the growth of the congregation, see Louis J. Lekai, *The Cistercians: Ideal and Reality* (Kent State University Press, 1977), especially pp. 44–49 for the gradual acceptance of feudal revenues and other possessions.

wealth at their feet, overturning the structure especially of Franciscan spirituality that they so much admired.² This repeated destruction of what they most admired is reminiscent of the case of a lifeboat that escapes from a sinking ship only to fall into peril because of the crowd of drowning men who try to climb aboard to save themselves. Of course, lifeboats are not constructed to hold so many, and the usual result is that either some of the people in the water are viciously repelled or the lifeboat itself capsizes. Similarly, according to very persistent medieval standards, the world is a dangerous place, in which salvation is as hard to attain as is preservation on a sinking ship. Safety lies with the professional religious, those who have left the path of the world for the lifeboat of the cloister, or in later cases, at least a firm rule of life that sets them off from the rest of society. But in their longing for security, many of the laity and secular clergy wanted to grasp this lifeboat, associating themselves with the contemporary model of religious life at least by their gifts, if they could not become full members of the religious elite themselves.

Such a process occurred in the case of the reformed monasteries of the tenth century. People saw what, by the norms of their society, was a sanctified life, and huddled as closely by it as possible. Not only did they offer gifts, though, which would leave this monasticism's claim to special piety—separation from the world and ritual purity for an elaborate daily round of prayer—intact. Increasingly, people demanded the advice and approbation of these holy men, as they had demanded it of the early hermits. They wanted access to monastic churches, conversation with monks, anything that would help bring them a secure sense of personal salvation. What then became of the religious superiority of these same monks, whose liminality was based on a ritual cleanliness that included separation from the sinking ship of the world and all its temptations?

The monks of the late tenth and eleventh centuries were caught in an odd dilemma. They were super-monks, with an ascetic life that, while it could not reach the standards of reclusion, still imparted an aura of holiness. Monastic literature is full of the sense that, thanks to a series of reforms, good monks really do lead lives of superhuman virtue. There is a smugness to accounts of the "angelic" abbots of Cluny and monasteries as a foretaste of the City of

² See Malcolm D. Lambert's magisterial study, *Franciscan Poverty* (London, 1961) for an analysis of the effects of growing wealth on the order.

God,³ that attests to the good opinion they had of themselves. After all, as the emperor Henry III (d. 1056) wrote in a letter to the abbot of Cluny, the prayer of monks is purer, the more they are distanced from all worldly affairs, and by this means they can most help the world. Because of this spiritual prowess, as the emperor says, "What wise man does not wish for the prayers of Cluny?"⁴ Cenobites had a special line communicating directly to heaven, as did the monks of Fleury, who, thanks to their powerful patron Benedict of Nursia, had never in their history lost one of their brethren to hell.⁵ This was certainly a proud boast, but members of many monasteries throughout Germany and Italy claimed little less. Prayer should not be underrated as a monastic duty—almost everyone in society believed it worked. Thus the institution of All Souls' Day by Odilo of Cluny sometime between 1024 and 1033, a day set aside for intercessions for the souls of *all* Christian dead, not just benefactors of the house, was a great gift to the community that, in its way, was as important as their fighting in some more worldly cause.⁶

The tenth-century and early eleventh-century monastic reforming movements in the Empire and France did indeed create the notion not only that a good monk was better than the run of humanity, but that most monks were good because of the careful regulation of new houses such as Cluny, Gorze, Einsiedeln, St. Maximin's in Trier, and so on. But what makes a monk good? Certainly to a large extent the proper monastic life was spelled out by biblical precepts: no lust or greed, or other vices enumerated in the Old and New Testaments, were allowable. Monks also had the Benedictine Rule as a model, which by this time they had elevated to an authority that seems at times to surpass that of scripture.⁷ Yet the Benedictine Rule

³ Fulbert of Chartres refers to Odilo as "the holy archangel of monks," Fulbert of Chartres, *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends (Oxford, 1976), #64, p. 108. Maiolus, Odilo's predecessor at Cluny, was also called "angel." See Robert G. Heath, *Crux Imperatorum Philosophia: Imperial Horizons of the Cluniac "Confraternitas," 964–1109* (Pittsburgh, 1976), p. 42. Gorzian monks, slightly more modest, came out in hagiography as "perfect men." See Friedrich Lotter, *Die Vita Brunonis des Ruotger* (Bonn, 1958), p. 87.

⁴ "Quis enim sapiens tuam orationem, tuorum non exoptet?" *Epistolae ad Hugonis Cluniacensis*, #6 from Henry III. PL 159: 931–32.

⁵ Adrevaldus, Aimoinus, et al., *Les miracles de saint-Benoît*, ed. E. de Certain (Paris, 1858), (I.40): 84. This section was written before 885.

⁶ Jacques Hourlier, *Saint Odilon, abbé de Cluny* (Louvain, 1964), pp. 127–28.

⁷ One can see this elevation of Benedict as early as the writings of Odo of Cluny, who in a sermon in Benedict's honor compares the monastic lawgiver to Moses and

had in turn become encrusted with tradition. Of the three monastic vows (stability, fidelity to monastic life, and obedience)⁸ one finds that the great struggle to obey or even to understand lay in the area of stability. Tradition emphasized that stability particularly required physical separation from the world, regarded commonly as unredeemed or semi-redeemed sinners. As Hugh of Flavigny tells in his *Chronicle* in the tale of a monk's visionary trip to hell, the monk, among a series of questions to St. Michael, his guide, asks: "Who is the serpent?" The answer is not surprising for a monastic account from c. 1000—"They are laypeople."⁹

However, as I pointed out in the second chapter, the notion grew that some people could become so holy that sanctity could protect them like a shell. This coincided with or helped to create a unique situation in the western Christian world in which the best fighters were exactly those with claims to special holiness—the struggle to create a purified Church, especially to eliminate simony and nicolaitism. As long as it was the need of the Church that drove them, rather than a personal longing for fame and influence, some monks, like Wolfgang of Regensburg, returned to the notion of the early hermits that internal stability was more important than physical seclusion.

i. *Lotharingian monasticism and the turn to the world*

Monks' activity in the world brought a response that was strong enough to alarm people, monks and non-monks both. At just about this time, when a group of Lotharingian abbots became more open to the laity in about the year 1000, the first firmly polemical voices were heard expounding a monastic code that included stability and physical retreat from infectious contact with the world. Three Lotharingian

acknowledges the saint's role above that of all fathers of the Church. See Odo Cluniacensis, *Sermo III. De sancto Benedicto abbate*, PL 133: 721–29, especially columns 722 and 724.

⁸ RB 58.17. I use Timothy Fry's translation of the much-debated second vow of "conversatio morum."

⁹ "Anima: 'Quis est serpens?' Angelus: 'Laici homines sunt.'" Hugo Flaviniacensis, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 8, (II. vision inserted after section 11): [a. 1011], p. 386. This is a good example of how well this image of the ungodly lay world persisted, since Hugh was not born until c. 1065.

abbots—William of St. Bénigne in Dijon, Richard of St. Vanne in Verdun, and Poppo of Lorsch (or Stablo)—were especially influential in monastic life, and their deeds mark them as leaders of this new sort of reform.¹⁰ They also aroused a greater level of rancor from more traditional Benedictine writers than had been seen before.

The key was still spiritual advancement. Stability was a safe haven for the untried. But once they had attained spiritual maturity, one gets the impression that this new band of reformers felt they could walk with confidence in the world, armed like hermit crabs with a shell of sanctity. Yet this belief led to many further questions. Many, probably most, monks remained content within the walls of the cloister and questioned the moral and physical well-being of anyone in regular contact with the laity. And even if such safety existed, who was to judge if a person had reached the state of spiritual security necessary for protection in the evil world? Besides that comes the ever-present question of motivation—is a person working for self or for God?

The *Deeds of the Bishops of Verdun* provides evidence that the rules of physical stability were weakening to allow ventures out of the cloister for the spiritual welfare of others. One of the oddest tales is that of a wayward recluse. This tale is particularly striking, since the recluse in question was a woman who was working for the spiritual welfare of others. The main part of the story concerns seven Irish monks who had settled in Verdun. They wanted to go to Cluny, because they had heard so much about it. Abbot Richard of St. Vanne in Verdun (c. 970–1046) refused them permission to leave, however. So they decided to jump the cloister wall and go anyway. But there was a hitch: a recluse living nearby received a vision warning of their planned escape. She left the cell that, as a recluse, she had vowed never to leave, warned Abbot Richard, and the Irishmen were compelled to maintain the stability they had promised in Verdun.¹¹

This peculiar story is more than a comic inversion of the natural

¹⁰ Sigebertus Gemblacensis, *Chronica*, MGH SS 6 [a. 1027], p. 356; see also Ernst Tomek, *Studien zur Reform der deutschen Klöster im XI Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (Vienna, 1910), p. 149. For biographies of these reform leaders, see especially Tomek; Neithard Bulst, *Untersuchungen zu den Klosterreformen Wilhelms von Dijon (962–1031)* (Bonn, 1973); and Hubert Dauphin, *Le Bienheureux Richard, Abbé de Saint-Vanne de Verdun †1046* (Louvain, 1946). Bulst is particularly useful for his explanations of the “mixed observance” followed by these reformers, a combination of Cluniac and Gorzian practices with common sense.

¹¹ Bertarius, *Gesta episcoporum Virdunensium auctoribus Bertario et anonymo monachis s. Vitoni*, MGH SS 4, (9): 48.

order of things in the early eleventh century (the events recounted probably occurred sometime in the 1030's or 1040's), as the wandering Irishmen are forced to remain stable and the stable recluse breaks her vow of strict permanence within the bounds of her cell. It also contains a caution not to give too much weight to Cluny's famous papal privilege of 931 that gave the Cluniacs the right to take in monks from other houses. It is one of several pieces of evidence indicating a shift in monastic attitudes among the circle of a leading reformer of the early eleventh century, Richard of St. Vanne. How could the author of the *Deeds of the Bishops of Verdun*, an anonymous and probably contemporary monk of St. Vanne (his entries cease in the year 1047),¹² view this breach of reclusion with equanimity and even with praise? When examined with other evidence of Richard's life and aims, this account strongly suggests the real novelty of some early eleventh-century reformers in the border area between Germany and France, especially Richard of St. Vanne and his contemporaries William of Dijon and Poppo of Lorsch.¹³

The traditional historiographical issue concerning this group of reformers around the millennium is whether they followed the customs of Gorze or Cluny.¹⁴ Looking at the personal rather than the institutional level raises totally different and, I believe, more fundamental questions. I would like to suggest that these influential abbots, linked by the patronage of Emperor Henry II and a shared interest in lay affairs, were in the process of working out a new understanding of the Benedictine life and the meaning of monastic vows, including even the extreme case of the vow of reclusion, that prevented complete compliance with the customs of any existing monastic union. While these reformers affirmed the need for rules for spiritual amateurs such as the unfortunate Irishmen described above, they felt that the professionals (i.e., themselves), who had mastered

¹² Ibid., (introduction): 38.

¹³ It is very interesting to note that Poppo's mother was originally against her son becoming a monk, but was won over after a dream. After that she became a recluse attached, of all places, to St. Vanne in Verdun. Everhelmus, *Vita Popponis abbatis Stabulensis*, MGH SS 11, (10): 299. It is interesting to speculate that she might even have been the recluse of the story.

¹⁴ For the most balanced modern views of the Lotharingian reform as neither Cluniac nor Gorzian, see Kassius Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*, *StAns* 22/3 (Rome, 1950/1951), 1: 494, 500; Bulst, p. 192; Karl Benz, "Heinrich II. und Cluny" *Rev. Bén.* 84 (1974): 314.

the basic rules, had risen to a level of greater spiritual freedom. Their chroniclers, in particular, suggest that some monks can move beyond rules to active involvement in aid of their fellow humans. This was a minority position within monasticism that roused harsh criticism as well as loyal support. And the question became more urgent of whether active involvement would fit under the rubric of Benedictine monasticism, garbed as it was in its long history of suspicion of the world expressed in physical withdrawal. We hear mostly of the deeds of Poppo, William, and Richard themselves, and do not know the extent to which other monks were involved in their activities in the world. Nevertheless, all accounts make it plain that this self-appointed spiritual elite took the job of contact with the laity upon themselves. Thus this new movement of monks who were reformers not just of other monks but of the laity or of the *ecclesia* constituted a truer revolution than did the reforms of the tenth century. A cleaner, fresher Anianian environment had been the goal of tenth-century reformers. What some monks were doing around the beginning of the next century provides evidence of a shift, rather than a relaxation, of traditional religious rules in at least this Lotharingian reforming circle. It helps us to understand the diversification within eleventh-century monastic life in new and perhaps more revealing terms than analysis of the historiographical controversy of Gorze versus Cluny.¹⁵

To return to the story of the recluse and the Irishmen, if one is to understand the significance of the event, first it is important to emphasize that the recluse of this story was acting very oddly. The chronicler tells that she had been shut up in a cell adjoining St. Mary's church for several years and that she left to convey her warning only because of a direct divine command (*divinitus imperatum est*). He adds that her appearance on the street caused wonderment to the people of Verdun—clearly it was very much unexpected.¹⁶ After all, reclusion

¹⁵ Cf. the debate on the aims of Henry II's reforms beginning with Tomek; Hanns L. Mikoletzky, *Kaiser Heinrich II. und die Kirche* (Vienna, 1946); Joachim Wollasch, "Kaiser Heinrich II. in Cluny" *FMSt* 3 (1969): 327–42; and Benz, *passim*. All are limited in scope because they examine reform leaders such as Richard of St. Vanne, William of Dijon, and Poppo of Lorsch only in the context of Henry II's often brutal reform of monasteries, rather than in the context of the reformers' own lives and other activities. The reverse is true of Dauphin, who is in general uncritical and often ignores Richard's political role. Albert Garreau, *Saint Léon IX: Pape Alsacien réformateur de l'église (1002–1054)* (Paris, 1965), pp. 9–10 mentions the story that Henry II wanted to quit the world and become a monk of St. Vanne.

¹⁶ Bertarius, (9): 48.

was a permanent state. The chronicler considered it necessary to emphasize in the strongest possible terms—divine command—that the recluse was not acting in a willful manner. Of course we cannot know her motivation any more than the chronicler could have. Still, limited to its bare bones the story tells us three important things: physical stability was accounted very important, a recluse left her cell to further the spiritual well-being of others, and the chronicler, while he felt it necessary to defend this action, considered it justifiable.

So what was this unnamed recluse up to? By the early eleventh century, recluses, male and female, were accepted not just as spiritual advisors but as visionaries, as in the cases of Wiborada, Paternus of Paderborn, and our anonymous recluse of Verdun herself.¹⁷ At the same time, though, a proper recluse did not leave his or her cell. The possibility of a problem arose when the way of holiness (for the recluse, physical stability) stood in the way of the goal of holiness (the care of others). This same dissonance appears in accounts of all three of our monastic reformers.

We can see Richard, William, and Poppo mostly as monastic reformers, but extant accounts show them all involved to a surprising extent with improving the religious life of the laity they encountered. All three made themselves thoroughly unpopular while reforming monasteries in the name of Henry II (emperor 1002–1024). Sometimes they even had to bring in imperial soldiers to enforce their authority. The usual interpretation of Henry II's reforms is that he was trying to improve monastic observance first in his duchy of Bavaria and then in the Empire. These three reformers and their followers stand out as receiving governance over some of the greatest and most venerable monasteries under imperial control. A monk should be a monk, the argument goes; so the emperor and his favored reformers swept through imperial monasteries like a new broom, refusing even to allow monks to enter the episcopate except in very rare cases.

However, unlike the targets of the tenth-century reforms, the houses thus attacked were not noticeably lax in their monastic observance. Instead, *different* customs were being imposed upon the monks. At one level the goal of reform was to make their lives more ascetically

¹⁷ See above how in 1049 a recluse made known to Abbot Richoldus of St. Emmeram the location of the body of S. Dionysius. Although the whole business was a fraud, the author apparently considered that the most natural way to win credence for this "vision" was to relay it through a recluse.

demanding and emphasize the superiority of monasticism in the world. But this does not account for the rancor these reformers attracted. The new reformers of the eleventh century presented variants of the Gorzian and Cluniac traditions that were by this time gaining the strength of familiarity and long usage.¹⁸ Henry II's reformers were doing something different. Raoul Glaber tells how William of Dijon had to deal with detractors as well as with people well disposed to him: "He [William] was an incomparable propagator of his congregation in his lifetime, so that monasteries under his command flowered with Rule and discipline. But although many religious and pious people loved him for this reason, many others among the fraudulent and impious defamed him and plotted against him." He had to face much ridicule and danger to carry out his twofold reform action—that of monastic reform along with reform of the greater Church.¹⁹ People were ready to pick holes in his reforming work, along with that of the other eleventh-century Lotharingian and Italian reformers who were his contemporaries, accusing them of novelty and trouble-making. Resented though they were, their opponents had not described the tenth-century reforms in terms of aberration from the Benedictine Rule. It was, however, precisely in these terms that people, mostly fellow monks, criticized the new generation of Lotharingian reformers.

Monks of these forcibly reformed communities of the eleventh century complained that it was the reformers who were breaking the Benedictine Rule, not the monks they were reforming. These detractions are nowhere plainer than in accounts of monastic takeovers, backed as they were by imperial force. We hear, for instance, that Fulda's abbot Branthoch II was deposed "without either divine or human judgment" and replaced with Poppo of Lorsch.²⁰ The author

¹⁸ One can only question the extent of these reforms. For example, Lorsch, although it had opposed the imposition of Gorzian customs in 940, is said to have held to its Gorzian organization for more than two hundred years in the face of other reforms, despite the fact that Lorsch was Poppo's main base for monastic reforming efforts. Hans-Peter Wehl, *Reichsabtei und König dargestellt am Beispiel der Abtei Lorsch mit Ausblicken auf Hersfeld, Stablo und Fulda* (Göttingen, 1970), p. 40.

¹⁹ "Regulari etiam districtione non minus effloruit atque incomparabilis huius ordinis suo tempore propagator extitit. Sed quantum pro hac re diligebatur a religiosis et piis, tanto magis detrehebatur insidiabaturque a fraudulentis et impiis." Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum libri quinque*, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford, 1989), (III.16): 120–122.

²⁰ Wehl, pp. 283–84. Wehl points out that Branthoch was a serious and pious man, who in 1023 became bishop of Halberstadt.

of the Quedlinburg annals is particularly disapproving, especially of Henry II himself for lending his support to this "reform." Dripping propagandistic venom from his pen, he tells how in 1013 "[t]he wise king Henry, perhaps deprived of counsel by fools," so viciously reformed the great imperial monastery of Fulda that the brethren were dispersed.²¹ The juxtaposition of wise king and foolish advisors suggests that the king did not indeed know enough to undertake monastic reform, and shows us a miniature conflict around the criticism of lay rights over the religious life that would lead in time to the wars of the Investiture Contest. The blame is divided between the emperor, too willing to listen to evil counsel, and the unnamed person or people who gave the advice. The annalist clearly found the situation itself an abuse and an outrage. He is particularly moving in his lament over the long tradition and continuity at Fulda, now lost. For 270 years, he says, monks had served God at Fulda; now, driven out, "they are made a spectacle to the world."²²

The same chronicler shows even more outrage in his account of Corvey's reform in the following year. Henry II himself visited Corvey, "and whatever of their life displeased him, he wished to correct with his imperial authority." The emperor's actions drove some of the monks to defend "the customs of their fathers." So they rebelled against the imperial orders, "those who were more just against the law of imperial savagery." The monks of course had no chance against Henry's trained troops. Henry had seventeen monks imprisoned; the others were expelled from Corvey on the emperor's orders. The Quedlinburg annalist acknowledges that the monks ought to have turned the other cheek rather than taken up arms. The actions and behavior of both sides were unedifying. As the annalist says of the rebellion itself: "But what things happened, one after another in our time, are more to be marveled at than to be commended by writing them down."²³ The weight of blame falls again on the emperor, and naturally on the reforming abbot, here Poppo of Lorsch, who imposed his student Druthmar of Lorsch as the new abbot of Corvey.²⁴ They are the savage ones, who have driven the monks of Corvey to

²¹ "Rex sapiens Heinricus, stultorum forsitan depravatus consilio. . . ." *Annales Quedlinburgenses*, MGH SS 3 [a. 1013], p. 82.

²² "spectaculum facti mundo." *Ibid.*

²³ "Quid deinceps actum sit, nostris temporibus magis est stupendum quam stilo commendandum." *Ibid.* [a. 1014], p. 82.

²⁴ Wehl, pp. 48–49.

resist. What adds poignancy to the account is that nothing was wrong with the conduct of the monks in their own eyes or in those of the annalist. As the annalist is careful to point out, the life of the brethren of Corvey was displeasing to Henry himself, not displeasing to God or to the Benedictine Rule. The rebel monks wanted only to defend the practices of their fathers, the founders of Corvey and of monasticism in the West itself.

For the most part we can only guess at the nature of the reforms imposed. On one point we can be clear, though—there is no evidence that monastic life at Fulda or Corvey or any of the other houses so roughly reformed was in any way corrupt, in the sense of unchastity, failure of communal life, or negligence in the offices.²⁵ Again for Corvey, the annalist depicts the reforming effort as an attack on the sound traditional practice of the monastery. As he says, the emperor changed by force the privileges and customs the monks had held for 239 years, that Louis the Pious had given them.²⁶ It is the monastic tradition itself that was being called into question, as these critics understood the matter, not the ability of the monks to carry it out as it stood.

What sort of changes were undertaken? The differences were doubtless clear to the monks who lived with them, but this is where our sources fail us almost completely. Annalists do not say precisely what this German reform was trying to accomplish, what new ideas the reformers were bringing with them. There has been considerable debate on the nature of Henry II's reforms. Earlier historians tended to characterize his reforming efforts as those of a man seeking greater control of the resources these wealthy monasteries held.²⁷ More re-

²⁵ The only eleventh-century case I can find with accusations of bad conduct is the reform of Hersfeld, in which the monks had fallen from the life of the Rule, and lived as if they were canons, seducing the regular monks there by their pomp and way of life. This is from a source favorable to the reformer who took over Hersfeld, Godehard of Hildesheim. Wolfherius, *Vita Godehardi prior*, MGH SS 11, (13): 177.

²⁶ *Annales Quedlinburgenses* [a. 1015], p. 83.

²⁷ Kaminsky sees Henry II's reforms in Saxony as reprisals for the animosity of Saxon nobles. Hans Kaminsky, *Studien zur Reichsabtei Corvey in der Salierzeit* (Cologne/Graz, 1972), p. 49. Helmut Lippelt, *Thietmar von Merseburg. Reichsbischof und Chronist* (Cologne/Vienna, 1973), p. 44 says Henry II was the first to make systematic use of the duty of hospitality to the ruler. Wehl, citing Mikoletzky, says Henry II wanted to re-apply the ideal of flight from the world in the cloisters for which he was responsible. Wehl also cites G. Mathäi for the argument that Henry II's reforms had economic grounds and goals. See Wehl, p. 42.

cently historians have looked at these reforms in terms of monastic practice. For them the debate has taken the form of Gorze versus Cluny or German Lotharingia versus Burgundy, thanks to the strong contrasts set up by Kassius Hallinger and his school. Wollasch has argued that Henry's reforms were in essence an imposition of the alien Cluniac customs on unwilling imperial monasteries.²⁸ Benz, to the contrary, has argued very persuasively from the records of imperial travels and the evidence of which abbots visited the imperial court most frequently that Henry's relations with Cluny were of a purely personal and friendly sort, an expression of his personal piety rather than of a new reform orientation.²⁹ Benz argues that Henry's reform of at least seven abbeys took place through monks and abbots of the Gorzian tradition.³⁰ The list of reformed abbeys includes Lorsch, Fulda, and Corvey, all the work of Poppo.

To judge by the valuation of contemporary monks, though, Poppo and the other Lotharingian reformers sent out by Henry II were striving for something less tame than the well-known reforms of Gorze and Cluny. Both arguments are too static to fit the events of the turn of the millennium. Both Wollasch and Benz assume that reaching a single definition of what constitutes "Cluniac" or "Gorzian" is possible, without leaving the possibility open that reformers probably made up customaries that were a *mélange* of Cluny, Gorze, and their own feelings on religious matters. While a community might adopt Cluniac or Gorzian customs for daily practice in the monastery—the number of times a year the monks should bathe, or the

²⁸ Historians for over a century have been tormented by the ghost of Cluny, trying to retain Cluny's place as the greatest religious influence in the middle ages in face of growing agreement that Cluniacs were not very active as reformers in Germany and Italy and were in general conservative in orientation. For example, Mikoletzky argued that all of Henry's reform efforts were guided and influenced by Odilo of Cluny, the two of them trying to re-apply the ideal of flight from the world. Mikoletzky, p. 42. Tomek also claims that the Lotharingian reform was Cluniac, p. 35. Wollasch has argued that Henry II saw Cluny as a source of new orientation for German monasticism, especially after he became emperor in 1002 and could work on a larger scale. Wollasch has also suggested that Henry turned to Poppo and Lotharingian monasticism only because Cluny was unwilling to take the initiative in the Empire. See Wollasch, "Kaiser Heinrich II," pp. 327–42; Joachim Wollasch, "Der Einfluß des Mönchtums auf Reich und Kirche vor dem Investiturstreit," in *Reich und Kirche vor dem Investiturstreit*, ed. Karl Schmid (Sigmaringen, 1985), pp. 35–48.

²⁹ Benz, "Heinrich II," pp. 313–37.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 314. The monasteries are Niederaltaich (996), Tegernsee (1001), Lorsch (1005), Hersfeld (1005), Reichenau (1006), Fulda (1013), and Corvey (1015).

procedure for bloodletting—it is certainly not clear what the monks believed and thought, how they viewed their world, both intra- and extramural, how ascetic the life of each monastery really was, and a myriad of possible variations. One should also remember that giving gifts to a famous monastery does not mean that the abbot was important in the transaction, since the gifts were presented to the patron saint. To give one example, while Henry II appears to have favored both Odilo and Hugh of Cluny, he admired Cluniac customs, but did not necessarily want them in his Empire.

In a very suggestive letter to Henry III, probably in 1046 (the year Henry forcibly organized papal affairs when he deposed the three popes who had been fighting for control of Rome, and replaced them with his own trusted German pope), Odilo asked to be used in the ecclesiastical reform. He argues forcefully for the deposition of Gregory VI, the only decent person among the three popes (although a simonist), and goes on to offer himself as an advisor to Henry III (d. 1056). Odilo praises Henry III's role in the fight against simony, idolatry, and Judaism. But that is not enough. Odilo says that advice on Church questions should come from the spiritual people of the whole world, not just Germans and Italians. Henry ought to choose his advisors from the whole world. Odilo was quite clearly angling for a job, but there is no evidence that Henry III ever accepted the offer of counsel.³¹ This simple letter forcibly supports the argument of this book. Odilo, the least conservative of the abbots of Cluny, clearly believed that monks like himself were vital for ecclesiastical reform. He hints that bishops were not adequate as imperial assistants, although traditionally bishops in council were the only force that could overrule the pope. Instead, Odilo declares the need for the holy man, the man like himself of superior spiritual prowess, who has a duty to act *because* he is a good monk.

While one can perhaps explain changes in the privileges granted to an imperial monastery as an effort to control the resources of these wealthy houses for political ends, changes made to customs present a different problem. Clearly the reformers were claiming to be in some significant way superior to those being reformed, to the latter's outrage. Thietmar of Merseburg, writing sometime between 1012 and his death in 1018, reports in regard to Alfkerus of Pöhlde's

³¹ Odilo abbas Cluniacensis, "Ein Schreiben Odilos von Cluni [sic] an Heinrich III. vom October 1046," ed. Ernst Sackur, *Neues Archiv* 24 (1899): 732–35.

"ruin" (i.e., reform) of Berge that the monks and abbots imposed upon Berge just simulated goodness, rather than being truly good; hypocrisy and the imposition of alien customs together comprise a strong accusation.³²

This process continued in the reign of Konrad II, who gave Poppo of Stablo authority over St. Gall in 1034. The monks there resented his reform attack so strongly that reference to it worked its way even into the St. Gall monk Notker's gloss on the Psalter. In his comments on Psalm 21, Notker charges that both Poppo and his fellow-reformer Richard of St. Vanne are not simply hypocrites, but heretics. He says they have changed the Benedictine Rule itself for their own purposes, a drastic claim in this era of respect for the memory of Benedict of Nursia. What is more, they have taken what was whole, the sound monastic practice of the imperial monasteries, and have rent it in twain.³³ Ekkehardt IV of St. Gall, the author of the last part of the *Casus s. Galli*, refers to the same reformers as schismatics in his account of their activities in his monastery, clearly identifying them as breaking off onto a new and unworthy path from the parent stem of Benedictine monasticism.³⁴

ii. *Hypocrisy and schism*

The two charges, those of hypocrisy and heresy or schism should, I believe, be treated separately. Charges of hypocrisy suggest that the reformers claimed to be in some significant way superior to those being reformed, an infuriating suggestion to the monks of some of the greatest houses in the Empire. There is some evidence that the reformers insisted on stricter asceticism than was normal for traditional monks, even those who followed the customs of one of the tenth-century reforms.³⁵ William of Dijon appears to have been very

³² Thietmar Merseburgensis episcopus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 9, (VI.20–21): 298. Thietmar's preference for old monastic customs is discussed in Lippelt, pp. 194–95.

³³ Notker der Deutsche, *Der Psalter. Psalm 1–50*, ed. Petrus W. Tax (Tübingen, 1979), p. 67; see Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny*, 1: 511.

³⁴ *Casus s. Galli*, MGH SS 2, (16): 142; discussed in Philibert Schmitz, *Histoire de l'ordre de saint-Benoît*, 2nd ed. (Maredsous, 1948–1956), 1: 197.

³⁵ An interesting case is that of William of Dijon, who began his career in a German episcopal monastery, but was strongly influenced by Cluny, where he spent some time under the patronage of Abbot Maiolus. While reforming monasteries

harsh to his monks. The author of the Chronicle of St. Bénigne tells how William, while ill, had a vision of the Last Judgment. In it God condemned William for his excessive harshness. Needless to say, after that William was much milder in his discipline.³⁶

Certainly there is a body of complaints from the Empire that some monks were carrying asceticism to extremes. These may well refer to followers of these reformers. The *vita* of Bardo, written at Fulda after the monastery had managed to shake off the reformers, tells that its subject was against people making a big show of asceticism. Instead, the author praises his hero's help of others, both as abbot of Fulda and later as archbishop of Mainz (1031–1051).³⁷ Similarly, Thietmar of Merseburg, critical of the new reformers in general, condemned excessive asceticism. He distanced himself from the reform of Gebhardus I of Regensburg, and cited especially strange habits of clothing as one of the unwanted innovations being imposed.³⁸ Wipo, the chaplain of Konrad II, inveighs against fasting and vigils in his *Proverbia* of c. 1030. He sees a clear choice of asceticism *or* good works, not one enabling the other.³⁹ Perhaps more clearly evidence of monks leaving their cloisters for supramonastic reform goals is the evidence of Alpertus of St. Symphorion in Metz, who complains about the perversion of the mores of his age in his *de diversitate temporum* ("On the changing of the times"), written in 1021 or 1022.⁴⁰ Monks have abandoned stability because of a blind cupidity for *false* honors and power,⁴¹ as seems, to phrase it in a positive light, to have been the belief of the reformers themselves. This is a case in which the charge of cupidity seems to bear out the charge of acquisitiveness by eleventh-century monks. However, what at least Richard, William, and Poppo sought was power and imperial support to carry out a program of reform, not the much simpler craving for wealth that

himself, though, William was certainly not a pure Cluniac, instead making heavy use of local tradition and of his own reforming ideals. See Bulst, especially p. 26, pp. 106–92.

³⁶ Cited by Bulst, p. 195.

³⁷ Vulcudus tells that Bardo performed good deeds day and night. Vulcudus, *Vita Bardonis archiepiscopi Moguntini*, MGH SS 11: 317–21, see especially (4): 319.

³⁸ Cited in Lippelt, pp. 193–94.

³⁹ Annerose Schneider, "Thietmar von Merseburg über kirchliche, politische und ständische Fragen seiner Zeit" *AfKG* 44 (1962): 38–39. See Wipo, *Proverbia*, MGH SS 11: 245–47.

⁴⁰ Cited in Lippelt, pp. 193–94.

⁴¹ Alpertus de s. Symphorianis, *De diversitate temporum libri II*, MGH SS 4, (II.9): 713.

such a word suggests. Similarly, contemporary movements in Italy, such as that of Romuald of Ravenna, placed a greater stress on asceticism than on mere stability, sometimes even in place of stability. In both cases their detractors either misunderstood them or did not accept the premises under which they worked. It seems that these reformers were trying to perfect a Benedictine approximation of the life of a recluse. As with recluses, asceticism was an enabling virtue, a precondition for work with the populace. This group of Lotharingian reformers was also very interested in the greater world; but the lesson had already been learned that it was the asceticism that attracted the people, whether bearing gifts or seeking spiritual guidance.

The other charge, that of heresy, goes more deeply, I believe, into what these reformers were attempting to accomplish in a larger world than the monastery. By imposing their "hypocrisy and heresy," this new brand of reformers forced their opponents to define their own Benedictine tradition in reaction to what they perceived as a series of innovations. Because of the very real need to defend themselves against attacks on their own houses and way of life, backed by the emperor's own authority, monks of the great imperial houses turned even more strongly than they had previously to their Carolingian past, which in many cases was equated to tenth-century Gorzian or Brognian customs in the Empire. They reaffirmed their tradition, damning any deviation as schism or heresy. Gorze, Brogne, and their daughter houses do not seem to have aroused such antagonism and hatred when instituting their customs. Sometimes they were lumped together with the old Carolingian-style monasteries, as houses reformed to Gorzian customs in the tenth century were reformed yet again by new monastic leaders in the eleventh. This evidence upholds my thesis that significant change in Benedictine beliefs and practices did not appear until the latter part of the tenth century, and that before that time the dominant pattern remained that imposed by Benedict of Aniane. Patrons gave gifts to monasteries of all three of the most important old reforming groups, including Henry II's gift of his crown to Cluny. In other words, there was no serious rift in the practice or beliefs of loosely-defined Benedictine monasticism. But by the time the forced reforms of Henry II's reign had been carried out, there was enough real difference among men who called themselves Benedictines, here the reformers and reformees, to create lasting bitterness.

I would like to suggest that we should view the wandering recluse of Verdun in the light of these reform activities. Henry II, under the

influence of Richard, William, Poppo, and others, was lending patronage to what was indeed an innovation within Benedictine monasticism, one with widespread repercussions.

All three of the reformers I have been discussing—Richard, Poppo, and William—had an extraordinary level of contact with the laity. Ekkehardus of St. Gall is most specific about Poppo of Lorsch's reform of 1034, which occurred during the author's lifetime. He levies a specific charge of innovation. It has always been the rule, the author moans, that St. Gall did not customarily allow even the most powerful secular clergy or the most noble laymen into its house. But St. Gall has fallen from this earlier purity. More specifically, the author of the *Casus s. Galli* believes that contact with secular society is both bad in itself and doubly evil because of St. Gall's particular tradition. Nevertheless, Poppo opened the gates to this pollution. As the author of the account saw during the time of Poppo's reform, laypeople had moved into areas set aside for the monks. As a result, Poppo cannot be a true monk, since he has abandoned the principle of separation from the world. Ekkehardus thus refers to the whole time when Poppo or one of his disciples ruled over St. Gall as the period of *monachorum scismatis*, "the time of the monastic schism." The evidence he uses to support this attribution all involves the laity. Not only important nobles such as counts but even their soldiers followed the monastic procession on feast days. They came with the monks into the cloister; at the abbot's invitation they even ate in the refectory on Easter—and talked during the meal, a gross breach of monastic propriety.⁴² It must have seemed that all the goals and achievements of the tenth-century reformers were being wiped out.

St. Gall's forcible reform is one of the occasional clues that in the early years of the second millennium some of the most zealous reformers were espousing more liberal views in allowing the laity admission to the monastery. Poppo of Lorsch had a reputation as a holy man that cannot be guessed at by reading this reference in the chronicle of St. Gall. But if Poppo was a proper monk in the traditional style, it seems impossible that he let soldiers go so far as to talk while enjoying an unheard-of meal in the monastic refectory. It would seem to be spiteful invention, except that chroniclers describe other reformers committing similar breaches in tradition. The phenome-

⁴² *Casus s. Galli*, (16): 142.

non even went beyond the radical reformers we are discussing. In the same period, Cluny would go very far to give good treatment to the spiritually promising. Richard of St. Vanne's mother visited Cluny, where she was allowed to enter the cloister and even sit in chapter with the monks, while on Sunday she joined with the monks in procession. Hugh of Flavigny relates that no other woman had ever been allowed to do such things.⁴³ This was against the whole weight of Benedictine tradition. It was certainly shocking at a reformed house, where the monks could be expected to lead lives uncluttered by the laity, especially women. At a house such as Cluny monks even collected their own dirty laundry and gave it to the servants, so the lay servants of the house would have no excuse to enter the cloister.⁴⁴ But the prohibition of women was more generally enforced. For example, Folcuinus in his *Gesta s. Bertini* tells that in 938 a woman, the wife of the lay abbot of St. Bertin, obtained permission when ill to go into the monastic church and pray at the altar of St. Bertin. Folcuinus dwells on the point that it was unheard of for any woman except a queen to do so.⁴⁵ If a monastery that was missed by reforming zeal in the tenth century and still had a lay abbot could take such a stand, it would indeed appear to be the norm that women were not allowed into Benedictine monasteries, even into the monastic church. Thus Poppo's actions at St. Gall were innovative indeed.

Richard was guilty of similar "impropriety" in encouraging contact between monks and laity, although his actions are not as thoroughly described as Poppo's. Richard himself frequently appears in the literature interacting with the laity in a variety of ways, both acceptable and unacceptable to the monastic norms of his day. In about 1044 Richard converted an egotistical grammarian to the monastic life, a typical case of dealing with a layman only to make him a monk.⁴⁶ He got other nobles to renounce the world, again a normal monastic function. It is more suspicious that Richard is said to have instilled good religion and morals through the example of his life.⁴⁷ How and why? How did the laity learn from him, unless

⁴³ Hugo Flaviniacensis, (II.16): 391.

⁴⁴ See W. Teske, "Laien, Laienmönche und Laienbrüder in der Abtei Cluny" *FMSI* 10 (1976): 248-322; 11 (1977): 288-339, especially 10: 271.

⁴⁵ Folcuinus, *Gesta abbatum s. Bertini*, MGH SS 13 [a. 938], p. 627.

⁴⁶ *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*, MGH SS 7, (59): 488.

⁴⁷ Bertarius, (8): 48.

he made himself known to them in some way? If he did, was it his own idea to do so, or had he been convinced by a text or a person that such activity was proper? On a wider scale, the chronicler Hugh of Flavigny describes the feast day of St. Vanne, at which a multitude of nobles, vulgar [peasants], bishops, abbots, monks, and clerics gathered, apparently receiving a warm welcome from Richard.⁴⁸ Besides having this free and easy contact with lay men (and probably women), Richard was an avid collector of relics,⁴⁹ the central locus for lay piety of the era. He played an important part in both the Peace and Truce of God movements, probably with the aid of the relics he had acquired.⁵⁰ Indeed, Richard put enormous amounts of money and effort into building an appropriate pilgrimage church, on a scale that shows he obviously expected many pilgrims to visit his relics, both new and richly refurbished.⁵¹ William of Dijon also began the construction of new monastic buildings at St. Bénigne in 1002.⁵² The anger of more conservative monks against this form of "outreach" can be seen in a letter of Peter Damian to Cinthius, the prefect of Rome. Peter told of a vision of Richard in hell, eternally building. He criticized Richard's vain construction and its wasting the goods of the Church.⁵³

Among these Lotharingian reformers architecture was a very common centerpiece, and bulks larger in the records than does education. Education in the Christian life was not consistently a goal, but it did appear. At the beginning of his career as reform director, in c. 990, the duke of Bavaria, the future Henry II, called in the reforming abbot Erkanbert from Swabia to reform Niederaltaich. Once there, the new abbot imposed stricter asceticism and flight from the world than the group of canons living there had practiced, replacing them with monks. In this case, he closed the monastery's excellent exterior school, as it was one more temptation in the form of contact with the world.⁵⁴ On the other hand, William of Dijon was very active in the education of both the secular clergy and the laity. Of

⁴⁸ Hugo Flaviniacensis, (II.25): 398.

⁴⁹ Patrick J. Geary, *Furta Sacra*, revised ed. (Princeton, 1990), pp. 65–66.

⁵⁰ Dauphin, pp. 255ff.

⁵¹ Geary, p. 69.

⁵² *Annales s. Benigni Divionensis*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1002], p. 41.

⁵³ Petrus Damiani, *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, MGH Briefe, #155, 4: 72–73.

⁵⁴ Georg Schwaiger, "Der heilige Gotthard, Abt von Niederaltaich und Bischof von Hildesheim," in *Bavaria Sancta*, ed. Schwaiger, vol. 3 (Regensburg, 1973), p. 115.

course, his was a special case, since much of his work was in the county of Normandy. Many Normans had not yet converted to Christianity, and certainly had little notion of its tenets, while most of the ecclesiastical structure had broken down in the civil war even before the Vikings began their raids. The count of Normandy convinced William in 1001 to take over the monastery of Fécamp in an effort to restore religious life in the region.⁵⁵ The extant account of the Norman situation helps suggest what the active missionaries in the east of the Empire did. William opened schools in his monasteries, specifically for the secular clergy but in fact for anyone who wanted to come. He also preached to the laity, and was active at several royal and noble courts to gain patronage and support for his work.⁵⁶ It is really only thanks to William's activity that his successor John of Fécamp had the firm base and the leisure to reproach William for his life of action.⁵⁷

Richard's most notorious impropriety in relation to the laity came in 1026, when he led a group of pilgrims (claimed to number 700) to the Holy Land. While in the east Richard even went as far as to preach in Muslim cities. He so aggravated the Muslims that they tried stoning him when he celebrated mass outside the city walls, although, as one would expect in the hagiography of the day, they missed both him and the altar.⁵⁸ The whole situation was an interesting interpretation of Benedictine stability and of the standard of withdrawal from the secular world, to say the least.

It is probably not a coincidence that it was during the lifetime of these three reformers, who favored contact with the laity, that the forged decretal of Pope Boniface IV to a Roman council appeared on the scene. It justified monks administering the sacraments and is the first text to refute purely juridical objections to the promotion of monks to the priesthood.⁵⁹ This false decretal's influence was important

⁵⁵ David Bates, *Normandy before 1066* (London, 1982), p. 193.

⁵⁶ Hartmut Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei*, MGH Schriften 20 (1964), p. 176; Bates, p. 193.

⁵⁷ For John's criticisms, see Jean Leclercq and Jean-Paul Bonnes, *Un maître de la vie spirituelle au XI^e siècle: Jean de Fécamp* (Paris, 1946), p. 199.

⁵⁸ Hugo Flaviniacensis, (II.18-24): 393-97. See also Ademar, *Historiarum libri III*, MGH SS 4, (III.65): 145.

⁵⁹ Paul Oliger, *Les évêques réguliers* (Paris, 1958), pp. 79-80; see also Ursmer Berlière, "L'exercice du ministère paroissial par les moines dans le haut moyen-âge" *Rev. bén.* 39 (1927): 233-34. It is interesting to note that this forgery occurred before canons regular appeared on the scene to challenge the sacramental rights of monks.

in breaking down the clear distinction of labor between monks and priests. Monks of course had been ordained to the priesthood from earliest times. The norm in the ninth and tenth centuries was for these monk-priests to exercise their office within the monastery. As long as this was the case, there was no reason for secular clergy to object to monk-priests; there was no conflict of interest. The defense this forged decretal provides for ordination and especially the administration of the sacraments by monks suggests that the situation had changed, and was causing some resentment. It also hints that at least some monks were interpreting their priestly office in a way that included at least some elements of pastoral care to the laity, for it was there that they were likely to give offense. Monks such as Richard of St. Vanne, William of Dijon, and Poppo of Lorsch show every indication of wanting to help their fellow humans whether they were monks or members of secular society. Even more to the point, they thought they had the right to do so, perhaps in their role both as monks and priests.

William of Dijon had the nickname *supra regulam*, "above the Rule."⁶⁰ Does this signify a belief in his circle that he kept particularly well to the Benedictine way, or that he thought himself above the Rule? Ample hints exist that by the early eleventh century at least part of the monastic community suffered from a considerable degree of pride (or clear-sightedness, depending on one's perspective) about their own spiritual state. They were considered, and considered themselves, the truly holy ones of society. But what were they to do with this spiritual superiority, including the priesthood, pinned down as they were by custom and Rule? Again, the issue was one of how to use spiritual gifts, how monks should personally interact with lay people, essentially separate from economic issues such as whether abbey demesnes were run by laymen or monks.⁶¹

iii. Gregory the Great and the active life

The answer for these reformers, although no source states it explicitly, appears to lie yet again in Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Care*.

⁶⁰ Franz Quarthal, ed., *Die Benediktinerklöster in Baden-Württemberg* (Augsburg, 1975), p. 34.

⁶¹ Dauphin, p. 165 marks this out as a hallmark of Richard's reforms.

These zealous reformers spent long periods in retreat, so that when they did take action they would have both divine support and wisdom, and the advantage of a populace humbled by their stories of asceticism and perfection. As early as the founding days of Cluny, an author described how Abbot Odo (926–44) worked for society, explaining that withdrawal from the world allowed him to judge affairs with detachment.⁶² The idea, certainly from Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, does not appear to have been taken up by later Cluniac abbots or their hagiographers. But among the new reformers we can see the alternation between detachment and involvement in the world, not just in Romuald's Italy, but in Lotharingia. Richard of St. Vanne, like other monks active in the early eleventh century, had strong anchoritic leanings.⁶³ He even spent five years as an anchorite, returning to his activities in the world only when forced to do so by his diocesan and the brethren of his monastery. Late in life he again retreated to solitude.⁶⁴ Poppo also gave much authority to his nephew Johannes, so he himself could live quietly at Stablo, his favorite monastery.⁶⁵ I believe this should best be understood as part of the Gregorian dialectic between action and contemplation. Withdrawal gave moral power, which in turn should be expended upon those in need.

These three Lotharingian reformers and their disciples account for reforming practices in a surprising number of the monasteries in Europe in the early eleventh century. Richard alone eventually governed 21 monasteries that were turned over to him for reform, passing them on in time to his disciples. Poppo, his disciple and in some senses his successor in the path of monastic action, was given control over all imperial monasteries by Konrad II (1039).⁶⁶ Needless to say, such activity certainly does not support generalizations, such as that of Duby in his study of French monasticism, that monks overall cut themselves off completely from the cares of the world.⁶⁷ Rather, the combined stories of these early eleventh-century monks who acted in such unmonastic ways suggests change, puzzlement, censure, and

⁶² Noreen Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh 1049–1109* (London, 1967), p. 23.

⁶³ Hallinger, 1: 504.

⁶⁴ Hugo Flaviniacensis, (II.29): 402; see also Leclercq, *Un maître*, p. 21.

⁶⁵ Everhelmus, (20): 305, (24): 309.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, (19): 305.

⁶⁷ Georges Duby, *The Three Orders. Feudal Society Imagined* (Chicago, 1980), p. 179.

enthusiasm for a new way of life, of which we can only see hints in the extant sources.

The anonymous recluse mentioned early in the chapter had spent years building a special relationship with God. When the day of the Irish monks' proposed escape came, she faced a moral choice: to stick to the letter of the law and remain in her cell, or to break the rules and by doing so save seven souls that were heading toward perdition. In the light of her environment, as part of the spiritual circle of Richard of St. Vanne of Verdun, I believe her choice was clear. It was Richard's own stance toward the world that made it possible for his chronicler to view her actions in a positive light. The fact that a vagrant recluse could receive such a positive account helps point to the depth of Richard's own turn toward the salvation of others in the world as the final step of *caritas*, care for his fellow humans, that set the normal rules of life to one side.

These reformers or their supporters still presented a certain ambivalence about their activity in the world. This is especially true of Everhelmus, Poppo of Lorsch's hagiographer, who seems determined to focus on his hero's humility. He tells, for example, how Poppo gave his own clothing to keep a poor leper warm—and the leper was healed by his new clothes. Poppo, afraid that the miracle would lead to popularity with the people, asked the leper not to make the facts behind his cure known.⁶⁸ Poppo's modesty went so far that there were not even many miracles at his tomb. Everhelmus says the reader should not wonder at this, since while he was still alive Poppo did not want to presume so far on God's grace and had always feared the favor of the people in life.⁶⁹ Thus the best evidence for Poppo's activities with the laity comes from his enemies. It seems that, on the whole, monks were nervous about or critical of activity that brought them or their fellows into the lay sphere. That even one of the "new" monks' supporters could be so timorous strongly reinforces the notion that these men were making a radical break from standard monastic practices and ideals.

As with recluses, historians are reduced to speculation as to why these monks looked more favorably upon the world. I believe that several factors were at work here. To begin, the monks involved *do* project a sense that they were superior to other beings in the world.

⁶⁸ Everhelmus, (8): 298.

⁶⁹ Ibid., (30): 313.

One can see this in William of Dijon's letter rebuking Pope John XIX for simony.⁷⁰ This superiority carried with it a moral imperative. If monks were barely surviving among the traps and pitfalls of this world, all their energy needed to be turned inward, toward making the monastic life itself more secure. But with all well in the cloister, they had leisure to compare themselves to the bureaucratic upper clergy and undereducated lower clergy of their time, and to consider the condition of the laity. Conditions were ideal for an apostolic revival. One should never forget that invasion and civil war never halted the work of the Carolingian renaissance.⁷¹ The educated had absorbed the new books that had become available, as well as new sources and ideas that had appeared in the ninth century, and were ready to speculate and even to think independently about the Fathers of the Church and scripture itself. The world was also beginning to appear less terrifying, as the little optimum improved conditions for most farmers. The tiny villages in the middle of a great forest that appear on maps of the early middle ages were giving way to increasing population in towns, and assarting, clearing new land for farming so the village was no longer so cut off from the world.

At the same time, and probably related in some way to this demographic change, the structures of Christian belief in general were shifting. We do not yet and, with our sources, may never know precisely when and why it happened, but Christianity by around the millennium was becoming more Christocentric. The early Church had tended to keep Christ distant as the divine logos or an icon of wisdom.⁷² By the Carolingian period, all levels of society for which we have information saw Christ as a being of power, almost subsumed in the person of God the Father, who had violently overthrown the devil and saved humanity from the certainty of hell. Still, he was a frightening and distant being, to be propitiated more than loved.⁷³ Sources by c. 950, however, attest to interest in Jesus as a

⁷⁰ Rodulfus Glaber, *Vita domni Willelmi abbatis*, found, with English translation, in Rodulfus Glaber, *Opera*, ed. Neithard Bulst, trans. John France and Paul Reynolds (Oxford, 1989), (10): 280–82. Rodulfus, *Historiarum*, (IV.3): 174. Discussed in more detail below.

⁷¹ See Margaret Gibson, "The Continuity of Learning, circa 850–circa 1050" *Viator* 6 (1975): 1–13.

⁷² See especially Thomas F. Mathews, *The Clash of Gods: A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art* (Princeton, 1993).

⁷³ See especially the fascinating evidence provided by the German poem *Heliand*, a retelling of the gospel story. *The Heliand: The Saxon Gospel*, trans. G. Ronald Murphy

human being. One begins to find comparisons of saints to Jesus, and his precepts take on a more personal importance for readers. No longer was it assumed that many of the Bible's teachings were meant only for the apostles, or at most for their descendants the bishops. They were applied, especially in *vitae*, as we will see, to abbots and even ordinary monks. Art from before the turn of the millennium shows a new emphasis on Jesus and his acts on earth. Thus, for example, besides the Gero crucifix of c. 970, justly lauded in textbooks as the first example in Western art of Christ dead on the cross, we find a series of other art works showing Christ not just as suffering savior but as very actively engaged in ministry in the world. Thus the fresco cycle of the miracles of Christ in the church of St. George, Oberzell on the island of Reichenau, dated to c. 975, shows a series of *acts*, each one of which focuses on the hand of Christ reaching out to teach or admonish. A similar emphasis on God in human form, working to further his own kingdom, can be seen in works as diverse as the Codex Egberti, a gospel pericope made for the archbishop of Trier in 980 and the bronze column of Bernward of Hildesheim, from 1050. Thus, despite the paucity of the artistic record from this period, we have three works from widely divergent locations, all preaching a gospel of action in the world, and all created by monks.⁷⁴

Some members of the laity wanted more from religion than the prayers of others, most probably especially those who could not afford donations to monasteries for special prayers. In this area there is clear evidence of pressure placed upon monks to share their spiritual advantages with the world. The picture that emerges from the eleventh century shows a mixture of conditions. Clearly, as with reform in general, people were ambivalent. Within the Benedictine tradition, some monks and monasteries continued to opt for exclusivity, while others, like Poppo of Lorsch, were more welcoming to the laity. There is no clear pattern. Small circles gathered under a charismatic leader, only, at least in this period in Germany, to dissolve upon his death. It is guesswork to consider how much Henry II intended to

(New York/Oxford, 1992), passim; Michael McCormick, "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages; Crisis, Litanies, and the Carolingian Monarchy" *Viator* 15 (1984): 1–23; Adolf Waas, "Karls des Großen Frömmigkeit" *HZ* 203 (1966): 265–79.

⁷⁴ Albert Boeckler, *Ikongraphische Studien zu den Wunderszenen in der ottonische Malerei der Reichenau* (Munich, 1961). For information on the Bernward column, see H.J. Adamski, *Christussäule im Dom zu Hildesheim* (Hildesheim, 1979), passim.

further monastic communion with the laity in his choice of reformers. Nevertheless, as we have seen, they had to face strong opposition in the form of tradition. There were always some monks who tried to reach an uneasy compromise between traditional monastic values and a more active impulse toward service in the world. Tradition, as with the monastic takeovers, became a bone of contention between conservatives and would-be world transformers.

iv. Invasion of the monastery

Traditional monastic life need not have been too upset by abbots involved in ecclesiastical reform or even the occasional special appearance of an important lay guest within the monastic enclave. For the most part, engagement in worldly affairs took place in the world, not in the celestialized sphere of the monastery. Yet general religious reform was a two-way street, in which the "enemies" (i.e., the laity) also fought on the monks' own territory.

One of the most worrisome questions for monks in the eleventh century was the problem of what to do with laypeople who came to worship in monastic churches. Two matters complicated the question. To begin, in the earlier medieval centuries especially, there was frequently a long period before a parochial system developed in a converted area, during which the monastery church in many areas may have been the only place of worship available to the laity, so there is a fragmentary tradition of lay access to monastic churches. Secondly, monastic churches, containing as they frequently did the relics of important saints, attracted pilgrims in ever larger numbers. It is in the eleventh century that evidence for a high level of pilgrimage to monasteries begins to appear. Both conditions made monastic churches attractive or necessary to the laity. To this we must add the question of whether the laity were better-received in monastic churches under the pressure of new reform ideals in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries. As with other problems that edged monks away from the Benedictine Rule, the variety of responses to lay visitors in the monastery suggests that the situation was indeed viewed as problematic, and, as in other cases, became a controversial issue that helped to define "appropriate" Benedictinism.

The monastic practice in the Merovingian and Carolingian empires was, from all evidence, to keep the laity out of the abbatial church

as much as possible, which fits in with the general exclusion of the laity reinforced by the Anianian reform. The most common means to accomplish this was to build a special church or chapel in or near the monastery especially for the laity. Already by the seventh century churches and chapels had proliferated in the average monastery; we know of several important houses with three complete churches; St. Vaast in c. 800 actually had six.⁷⁵ The prosperity of the religious houses that allowed such building programs for liturgical purposes also made it possible to build churches set aside for the laity. This situation did not change in the ninth and tenth centuries, and remained one way of dealing with the laity in the eleventh. This was the case at Farfa. In the tenth century this important northern Italian monastery had five churches, one of which was located outside of the monastic enclosure. The monks intended it especially for women, since they were not allowed into the monastery.⁷⁶ It is impossible to know how frequently lay places of worship were set aside in this way, but at least sometimes it was done, and men as well as women were excluded.

Certainly the isolation of the monastic church from lay worshipers was hardly strange in the early eleventh century. The chronicle of the monastery of St. Mihiel in Verdun, written before 1037, describes such a case in an account of the foundation of St. Mihiel in the eighth century: the founder built a monastic church and then had another church constructed beside it, in which he and his family could pray, so they would not disturb the monks.⁷⁷ The chronicler clearly approved of the arrangement and did not treat it as in any way out of the ordinary, which suggests that, even if two separate churches no longer functioned at St. Mihiel's, at least he had heard of such practices elsewhere. One can still see the monastic and lay

⁷⁵ Angelus A. Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier* (Münster, 1973), p. 299. Part of the purpose behind this multiplication of monastic churches, as Häussling argues, was certainly to allow space for the celebration of more masses and to permit a more elaborate liturgy, which included processions after the model of the Roman Station services.

⁷⁶ The same account notes that the abbot and monks went out to the women at this church for spiritual ministrations, but of course this would have been a much more controlled and limited situation than would be possible if women went into the monastic enclosure. Hugo abbas Farfensis, *Destructio monasterii Farfensis 890-997*, MGH SS 11, (2): 533. The *Destructio* was written at some point after 1000 and before the author's death in 1039.

⁷⁷ *Chronicon s. Michaelis in pago Verdunensi*, MGH SS 4, (3): 80.

churches of the eleventh-century German foundation of Groß Comburg near Schwäbisch Hall—the monastic church at the top of a steep, walled hill along with the rest of the monastic enclosure, the lay church completely separate at the foot of the hill.

The Cistercian practice of building separate chapels for the laity rather than allowing them into the main monastic church is usually cited as a great innovation, reflecting the very different relations the Cistercian congregation had with secular society, compared to their traditional Benedictine forebears.⁷⁸ Yet this innovatory status cannot be sustained in face of these earlier examples of churches and chapels constructed for the laity.

The only point upon which we can be certain is that the laity visited monastic churches for the sake of the relics guarded by the monks. As Hubert points out, until the twelfth century any Benedictine monastery that was at all important tended to become a pilgrimage center, at least for the region surrounding it.⁷⁹ One should note two points here. With the fragmentary state of our information, it is impossible to say how many monastic churches *were* large and prestigious enough to attract a significant cult. And there is no reason to believe that pilgrimage fashions changed radically between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. In the thirteenth century there is clear evidence that most cults had only a brief flare of popularity and then were quickly forgotten.⁸⁰ Also, a visit to relics is certainly not the same thing as attending services in a monastic church or interacting with monks. Relics were most often kept in the church's crypt, well away from the monks. For example, Folcuinus of Lobbes describes a popular panic in 959, induced by the sudden and miraculous appearance, as he says, of the sign of the cross on people's clothing. He tells how the multitude responded by flocking to the crypt of the monastic church of St. Bertin, to pray before the relics

⁷⁸ See for example Jean Hubert, "La place faite aux laïcs dans les églises monastiques et dans les cathédrales aux XI^e et XII^e siècles," in *I laici nella "societas Christiana" dei secoli XI e XII*, Settimana Mendola 3 (1968), p. 473. Giles Constable, "Monasteries, Rural Churches and the *Cura animarum* in the Early Middle Ages," in *Christianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica*, Settimana Spoleto 28 (1982) 1: 371 asserts (without citing his evidence) that many tenth- and eleventh-century monastic churches were open to lay worshippers.

⁷⁹ Hubert, p. 472.

⁸⁰ See Ronald C. Finucane, *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England* (London, 1977).

kept there.⁸¹ One should note three points about this passage. First, the relics are kept in the crypt of the church, rather than in a more easily accessible place. Second, the relics themselves are clearly the objects of veneration and reassurance in this story, not words of wisdom from the abbot or a ritual act such as the celebration of the Eucharist. Third, it is an exceptional situation that prompted the people of the area to visit the relics. It took no less than a miraculous manifestation to gather a crowd.

A monastic community would not wish to drive away pilgrims for many reasons, reasons both praiseworthy and not. Monks were the caretakers of the saints' relics, a source of abundant grace for all visitors. The saint's day was an occasion of monastic celebration, and not surprisingly the laity demanded a place. For example, the feast day of St. Vanne at Verdun, the patron saint of the monastery, was probably typical in attracting large numbers. As the chronicler informs us, at some point before the chronicle breaks off in 1047 the feast of St. Vanne attracted not just bishops, abbots, monks, and clerics, but also a multitude of nobles and "the vulgar."⁸² The saint's devotees were clearly hoping for miracles. Another Verdun account, from the monastery of St. Mihiel, tells that when the community acquired the relics of St. Callixtus late in the tenth century, both men and women gathered to them with their vows and oblations. Of course, miracles rewarded their faith.⁸³

Evidence suggests that the pilgrimage trade was increasing by the year 1000. The occasional encroachments of the tenth century appear to have become a tidal wave at many monasteries in the eleventh. Monks were torn between desire for both spiritual and monetary gain and longing for their accustomed privacy, and perhaps were also anxious to accommodate the spiritual needs of the laity. On major feast days the shrines were packed. To give an example, a fire at Vézelay in 1120 killed 1127 pilgrims.⁸⁴ It is difficult to evaluate whether monks were acting well or badly by displaying their relics only on special occasions. As it was, most pilgrims never saw the actual relics. Instead they collected objects that had come

⁸¹ Folcuinus [a. 959], p. 631.

⁸² Hugo Flaviniacensis, (25): 398.

⁸³ *Chronicon s. Michaelis*, (20): 83, (36): 85.

⁸⁴ Jonathan Sumption, *Pilgrimage: An Image of Mediaeval Religion* (Totowa NJ: 1975), p. 214.

into contact with the saint.⁸⁵ At times the laity responded violently, clearly in the belief that they had the right to see and make vows to relics. The monks of Ste. Foi in Conques' refusal to display their relics more frequently led to rioting. Eventually the monks had to ask the pope to intervene, which he did by ordering laypeople not to take relics out of churches without the permission of the abbot.⁸⁶

Some of the most important monasteries went to enormous expense to keep their churches and observances relatively unscathed even with increases in the pilgrimage trade. This is a period of great innovation in architecture, much of which was designed specifically to channel the flow of pilgrims in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.⁸⁷ The most notable change in church planning is the romanesque development of the totally subterranean crypt in churches that housed important relics. This made it possible for pilgrims to visit the relics freely without disturbing the offices being sung in the church. Perhaps even more significant for daily purposes was the development and introduction to monastic architecture of full stone screens between the choir and the nave of the church, so that the monks could remain in the choir totally out of sight of lay worshippers.⁸⁸ It was a revealing attempt at compromise, for it acknowledges that the laity have a right to visit the relics and that the monks have a duty to allow laypeople access to this channel of grace. As a speculation in hope of future returns alone, such architectural additions would have been a very major expense. What is more, abbots used much of the wealth of offerings to embellish the saint's shrine. Thus the shrines of famous saints could be astonishingly decorated. In one famous case, when the monasteries in England were closed in the early sixteenth century, the gold and jewels of Thomas Becket's shrine filled 26 carts.⁸⁹

There is no reason to doubt that at times Benedictine monks had good intentions when they opened their houses to pilgrims. Certainly abuses existed, but encouragement of cults, like more general

⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 82–83.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Horton Davies and Marie-Hélène Davies, *Holy Days and Holidays. The Medieval Pilgrimage to Compostela* (Lewisburg, 1982), p. 46. They identify several churches as pilgrimage basilicas because during that period many churches were built or rebuilt to have ambulatories, and several had side aisles, or even a double side aisle to channel pilgrims away from the chancel or even the nave. See p. 6.

⁸⁸ Hubert, pp. 477–81.

⁸⁹ Davies and Davies, p. 106.

communication with the laity, was not simply a matter of gain or honor in the eyes of the world. Especially in the eleventh century, there is ample evidence that all levels of professional religious were showing increasing concern with the religious life of the laity. This was most plainly expressed throughout the literature of the Gregorian, i.e., papal reform, which I believe has been most ably described as a turn by the Church from rejection of the world to an effort to "conquer the world" for its own sake.⁹⁰ Pilgrimage was a central part of that religious life. Monasteries of course had some of the most famous relics in Europe, including those of many of the most important and powerful saints. Ever more, whether they were willing or not, monasteries were opening to the laity.

Thus at least parts of the Benedictine establishment in the eleventh century faced a double pressure. We can see especially clearly in the case of pilgrimage the pressure of the populace, who wanted to use these monks, of recognized moral superiority, for their own spiritual advantage. It is also plain that some monks let themselves be put into such roles for purposes ranging from encouragement of the pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela⁹¹ to an occasional role in the Peace and Truce of God movements. Still, lay pressure and avarice were only part of the issue. Monks were not just forced against their will into such activities and points of contact with the laity. They often volunteered, or even forced their way into such active positions in the world as Odilo had attempted in 1046, to the anger and dismay of some of their own fellow Benedictines.

v. Is monasticism enough?

Meanwhile, much of the traditional *raison d'être* of monasticism, its function as the prayer center for society, was being undermined by

⁹⁰ Paulo Brezzi, "Fuga dal mondo e conquista cristiana del mondo nella riforma gregoriana," in *Chiesa e riforma nella spiritualità del sec. XI* (Todi, 1968), pp. 1–35.

⁹¹ Cluny has often been credited with leading the reconquista in Spain, but there is no evidence for their activities except for encouragement of the pilgrimage to Santiago and provision of some bishops beginning in the late eleventh century. Segl points out that, even in a land much closer to their monastery, the Cluniacs did not have a great influence on the Iberian peninsula in the eleventh and early twelfth century. In Castile and Léon, the areas with greatest Cluniac contact, there were scarcely twenty monasteries that adopted Cluniac customs. Even then, unlike the monks of Germany and Italy, they did not pass from the stage of development in

religious changes that are well shown in the following anecdote. The chronicler Raoul Glaber tells of a monk visited by a demon when it was time to get up for matins: "Why," he [the demon] asked, 'do you monks have so many labors, so many vigils and fasts, not to speak of afflictions and psalms, and many other humiliations and disciplines, beyond the common usages of other humans?'" After all, the tempter pointed out, laypeople who persist in sin to the very end of their lives get the same eternal rest that monks expect—a single day or hour is all that one needs to get eternal blessing. So why not stay in bed and ignore the signal for matins when it sounds?⁹² Although the monk involved realized in time that this was demonic temptation, this story exemplifies well the inner confusion that must have faced more introspective monks in the tenth and eleventh centuries. We can sense in this tale a God who is willing and eager to forgive sinners, rather than a vengeful God who must be propitiated constantly. It takes only an hour to amend the ills of a misspent life and to win God's grace. Even a layperson, who cannot even address God in proper Latin, can do it. If this is the case, what becomes of the hallowed role of monks as intercessors for sinning humanity? With the assumption that ordinary people can intercede with God on their own behalf, much of the social edifice of Carolingian monasticism crumbles. The prayers of monks are no longer the only way to reach God. Although most monks maintained their position as a professional prayer elite, tales such as this one sowed a seed of doubt, a suggestion that the Benedictine monopoly of the holiness market was perhaps not enough to justify the existence of monks. Ought a monk do something more than pray, to justify all those fasts and psalms that set him aside from the common run of humans? Do all the humiliations and labors of the monk's life obligate him to go further than prayer in his service of humanity to justify this excessive virtue?

Thus the hallowed justification of monasticism as a prayer institution eroded, leaving visible traces in the historical record such as Raoul Glaber's account by about the year 1000. This was of course

which the ruler took the initiative on reform. Peter Segl, *Königtum und Klosterreform in Spanien* (Kallmunz, 1974), p. 218. Gerd Tellenbach, "Zum Wesen der Cluniacenser" *Saeculum* 9 (1958): 374 says, citing Erdmann, that the Cluniac activity to organize the reconquest in Spain in the first half of the eleventh century is "pure fantasy."

⁹² "Cur," inquires, 'uos monachi tot labores, tot uigilias atque ieiunia, necnon afflictiones et psalmodias, pluresque alias humiliaiones excercetis extra communem aliorum hominum usum?' Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum*, (V.1): 216.

a gradual process. Throughout the middle ages, men and women continued to feel a need for monastic prayers as well as the masses celebrated by priests, doubting their own ability to obtain grace without help from professionals. Nevertheless, the tempter of the story does point to the way of the future. The duty of prayer for the world is not even an issue in this temptation account; the reason presented for dragging oneself out of bed in the middle of the night to sing matins is personal salvation. Does the demon have a point when he asserts that monks, with all their fasting, psalmody, and other afflictions, are working too hard for this goal? Whence did this temptation come, if not from a voice whispering inside at least one monk that monks *do* lead a holier life than do the common run of the human race, accompanied by the sneaking suspicion that it is not worth it?

The best answer to such doubts was to put the surplus of piety earned in the monastery into use in the world. At the same time, because of more general religious changes in society, the Christian community had probably never been so receptive to monastic teachings, nor so eager to draw spiritual potency from the monks. Thus, two factors, a sense of accomplishment as monks and a broader religious change toward more personal and positive contact with God, joined to create a particularly dynamic period in monastic history. While most monks were content to remain with their traditions, individuals and some whole monastic communities tried to expand the boundaries of Benedictinism and redefine the role of the monk in the world.

As with forced monastic reform, more general change in monastic practices is usually visible only through the criticisms it evoked and the defenses made by its proponents. It is here that we find the process of definition. The norm rarely merits comment in the sources; it is to the distorted and tendentious arguments that we must look for insight. They leave us with a picture of confused tradition, as we have already seen. By the year 1000 more monks appear to be emerging from the cloister and trying to play a role on a wider stage. Their traces are not quantifiable, but the sources present new controversies and criticisms that make it plain that greater activity is taking place.

The assumption in these texts, from the reforming circles and from more active monks in general, was that monks *wanted* to remain quietly in their monasteries and were only forced to turn to public activity,

especially preaching, by the manifest need of the Christian community. Stability of the mind, a state of peace that would allow a monk to pass through any trial or temptation with purity of heart and mind, was of course not a new ideal. The defenders of active monasticism in the tenth and eleventh centuries could look to the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers* and John Cassian, besides other early monastic works. John Cassian for example made it clear that he considered the goal of withdrawal from the world to be the gradual creation of *stabilitas mentis*, without which no physical separation could be of benefit. Cloisters were the training grounds within which the ascetic learned to care for his thoughts, and in time attain mental stability, in which he was truly dead to the temptations and distractions of the world.⁹³ Still, few monastic works mention this state of mental stability before the mid-tenth century. Monastic legislators focused on the physical withdrawal of monks from the world; within the monasteries, liturgical prayer following specific prescribed forms was stressed above the mental state of those who prayed.⁹⁴ Both monastic writers and ecclesiastical authorities assumed that if a monk left the protective custody of his cloister he would almost inevitably succumb to temptation. As far as the extant sources allow us to see, there was little

⁹³ See John Cassian, *The Conferences*, trans. Edgar Gibson (Grand Rapids, reprint ed. 1978), (VII.6): 365. (SC 42, p. 253.) See *Sayings of the Desert Fathers, The Alphabetical Collection*, trans. Benedicta Ward (Kalamazoo, 1975), (Theodora. 8): 72, (John the Dwarf. 18): 89–90, (Syncretica. 19): 234 for good examples.

⁹⁴ This is strongly borne out by all monastic legislation from the latter part of the eighth century on. A large majority of the canons of the various documents for the Anianian reform deal with liturgy, while almost nothing can be interpreted as an emphasis on the monks' state of mind. For the Aachen legislation and preceding works, see CCM 1. This liturgical focus can be seen in more detail in Hildemar's and Smaragdus' ninth-century commentaries on the RB. Hildemar, *Expositio Regulae*, ed. Rupert Mittermüller (Regensburg, 1880); Smaragdus, *Expositio in regulam s. Benedicti*, ed. Alfred Spannagel and Pius Engelbert, CCM 8. The tenth-century *Consuetudines Floriacenses Antiquiores* also discuss prayer only in a liturgical setting, as do German customs from the tenth century. These may be found in CCM 7,3. The *Liber tramitis* follows the same trend. CCM 10; see p. lii for dating. Even in England the emphasis was firmly on liturgical prayer, as can be seen in [Aethelwold], *Regularis concordia Anglicanae nationis monachorum sanctimonialiumque*, trans. and ed. Thomas Symons (London, 1953). The authors of histories and *vitae* also place many of their anecdotes in formal liturgical settings, and even bishops who had never been monks were praised for following the monastic liturgical round. An extreme case is Ulrich of Augsburg, who neglected his episcopal duties for the sake of the liturgy. Gerhardus, *Vita s. Oudalrici episcopi*, MGH SS 4: 377–425. (For a movement away from this monastic model for the ideal bishop beginning in the tenth century, see Stephen C. Jaeger, "The Courtier Bishop in *vitae* from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century" *Speculum* 58 (1983): 291–325.)

confidence that a monk had either the will or the strength to keep his mind untouched and pure of secular thoughts, if he discovered them while out in the world.

As the tenth century progressed it remained a matter for wonderment if a monk remained unsullied by contact with the world, but it was recognized as possible. A Cluniac hagiographer praises Abbot Maiolus of Cluny for maintaining his purity despite his active life: he spent much time at imperial and royal courts, seeking not his own good, but that of Christ. He intervened on behalf of people who were wronged, and won many laypeople to the monastic life. Despite all of this worldly distraction, he remained a true monk: "And although he often dealt with those in earthly palaces, still his soul in no wise turned from the way of the heavenly life."⁹⁵

More interesting are the times when the distinction between mental and physical states of withdrawal was made concerning ordinary monks, rather than abbots, who always occupied an uncomfortable border position in relation to the world, since they had a foot in both the monastery and in secular affairs. In the early eleventh century, Froumund of Tegernsee wrote to a friend that, although he had left the monastery of St. Magnus for another monastery, he had not really separated from it in a meaningful sense. The separation was only a physical one; he protests that his mind is still connected to his former brethren by ties of love.⁹⁶ Although Froumund's letter does not deal with the normal Benedictine sense of stability—the monk was still in *a* monastery, which was the important thing—it reveals the growing complexity of thought on the subject. Monks who wanted to act in the world could use such arguments very effectively.

Arnoldus of St. Emmeram's in Regensburg is careful to make the point that his hero Wolfgang is not guilty of instability. He uses the argument that Wolfgang, despite his missionary wanderings, always maintained mental stability. Thus, Arnoldus insists that, when Wolfgang set out as a missionary to Hungary, he was "deserting the monastery, and not monasticism." He was to be praised rather than censured for this venture into the extra-claustral world. In Arnoldus' eyes, Wolfgang could remain firm in his monastic commitment, despite his

⁹⁵ "Itaque licet in terreno saepius conversaretur palatio, animus tamen in nullo se flectebat a coelestis vitae proposito." Syrus, *Vita Majoli abbatis Cluniacensis*, AASS Mai II, (23): 674.

⁹⁶ *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*, MGH Epist. Selectae 3, #6, p. 8.

interaction with the affairs of the world.⁹⁷ Similarly, when Wolfgang was promoted to the episcopate, he remained a monk. Not only did he continue to wear the monastic habit and live as much as possible by monastic custom (a practice commonly ascribed to monk-bishops), but he also "had within him humility of mind."⁹⁸

Humility was used to unlock the doors of the cloister. These active monks, or their defenders, justified much action in the world on the grounds that the monks involved did not want to do it and were forced by an abbot or bishop into humble compliance. Only those who wished to spend a quiet life in the cloister were considered fit for the work of God in the world. Thus the way opened for a double debate over monks interacting with the lay world. On the one hand was the simple question of whether it was permissible or not, under any circumstances. On the other hand, both critics and apologists found it necessary to raise the question of intention. To be a good monk while in the world, did a man have to be dragged out of his monastery by brute force? What causes were sufficient to induce a normally placid and stable monk to go out and confront the temptations arising from mingling with the laity who, while inferior, were still Christians?

Significantly, by the early eleventh century a number of abbots became interested in an increasingly specific program of reform of Christian morals and of the organization of the western Church. Odilo is the first of the Cluniac abbots to stand out for his role at synods and at the royal and imperial courts; his activities coincide with similar world-valuing activities by the Lotharingian reformers we have been examining. For example, an important question is how active monks were in the Peace and Truce of God movements. The Peace movement arose from the chaos of France in the late tenth century, and later spread to northern Italy and Germany as a way to combat the lawlessness of a society in the early stages of feudalization.⁹⁹ There is little evidence of monks organizing the early stages of the Pax Dei, but nonetheless they played an important role in Peace assemblies.

⁹⁷ Arnoldus de s. Emmerammo, *Ex libris de s. Emmerammo duo*, MGH SS 4, (II.2): 556.

⁹⁸ "intus habuit humilitatem mentis." Ibid., (II.4): 557.

⁹⁹ For general information on the Peace and Truce of God movements, see especially Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*; also the articles in Thomas Head and Richard Landes, eds., *The Peace of God. Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* (Ithaca, 1992).

The Peace of God was established in a region by drawing together the people of the area and inducing them to swear to respect certain sectors of society, such as unarmed men and women, and the clergy. The monks most commonly brought relics to the assemblies, without which no oath could be sworn.¹⁰⁰ Participants must have assumed that monks would attend such meetings, so it is not surprising that their presence is mentioned only under special circumstances in which they played an unusual or especially important role. Besides this quiet support of the Pax Dei, there are some accounts of monks who were active in propagating this movement and also the Truce of God, which limited warfare to certain days of the week and forbade it during certain holy seasons such as Lent and Advent. The Benedictine Adhémar of Chabannes was a zealous propagandist, as was Richard of St. Vanne.¹⁰¹ Abbot Odilo of Cluny attended several Peace conferences and was an important leader in the Truce of God movement.¹⁰² But it seems likely that the religious impetus of the movements came from Lotharingia, rather than the other way around. I tend to agree with historians who see the role of Cluny in the Peace and Truce movements as overstated. This seems to fit better with the myth of Cluny as *the* monastery of tenth- and early eleventh-century Europe, in an effort to keep Cluny in the forefront of the literature when actually monks in other areas were doing more interesting things.

Besides abbots, growing numbers of ordinary monks became involved in a new concern to spread monastic values to society as a whole. Still, the majority of monks remained aloof from direct participation in the issues of Church and moral reform;¹⁰³ indeed there

¹⁰⁰ H.E.J. Cowdrey, "The Peace and Truce of God in the Eleventh Century," in Cowdrey, *Popes, Monks and Crusaders* (London, 1984), pp. 45–46. There are several accounts of how relics brought by monks to Peace assemblies worked miracles, thus winning the people to the cause. For examples, see Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*, pp. 18–20, and most of the articles in Head and Landes.

¹⁰¹ Cowdrey, p. 46; Dauphin, pp. 255–64.

¹⁰² Odilo's role in establishing the Truce of God is attested by Hugh of Flavigny and Raoul Glaber. See Hourlier, pp. 108–109. There is also some evidence that the Cluniac role in the Peace movement has been overstated. See Hoffmann, *Gottesfriede*, pp. 41, 45, 86, 130–31.

¹⁰³ Gerd Tellenbach in *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (reprint ed. Toronto, 1991), pp. 82–84 looking at a slightly later situation, rightly points out that it was only a minority of monks who were actively involved in the general reform of the Church. He is careful to consider, however, the importance of monks for the reform movement through their general practices, which,

is evidence that the new trend alarmed many. It is from this context that we should see the growing diversification of religious life in the eleventh century.

Monks are most visible where they allied themselves with a cause that gradually won general acceptance in the Christian community—such as the fight against simony. The approval that many contemporaries as well as succeeding generations felt for this cause made it much more likely that evidence of involvement would be preserved, rather than lost in a flood of disapproval for such “unmonastic” behavior. Considering the care taken to instill veneration for the Eucharist in monks, as well as the movement to render monasteries more independent of secular controls, monks should naturally have entered at some level into the debate about simony. It was not only the “best” of the monks who were concerned about the issue, either. The Cluniac chronicler Raoul Glaber, who can hardly be considered an ideal representative of his congregation, took a strong stand against simony.¹⁰⁴ It is through his writings that historians have come to view the emperor Konrad II as indifferent or destructive to the Church—Raoul shows the emperor as a simonist, and darkens Konrad’s entire character in his chronicle because of a couple of instances in which the emperor engaged in simony.¹⁰⁵

In Raoul Glaber’s writings, monastic zeal and public action against simony go hand in hand. His heroic portrayal of Abbot William of Dijon (962–1031) shows William’s entire life from the perspective of reform, both of monasticism and of the Church. From the beginning, Raoul depicts William as toughly independent, following his own understanding rather than the norms of Benedictine life of his day. William was originally an oblate to Lucedio, near Vercelli. While there, he refused to become a deacon, since he was not willing to swear an oath of obedience to the simoniac and interfering bishop of Vercelli. In 987 he transferred to Cluny and soon went on to reform

among other advantages, accustomed people to thinking about the Last Judgment and led to an increased reverence for the sacraments.

¹⁰⁴ Rodulfus’ *Histories* were completed shortly before his death, probably in 1049. These *Histories* have a unique quality since the author totally ignored the annals of the tenth and early eleventh centuries, using instead *vitae*, oral sources, and what he saw himself, so his work has more immediacy than that of most chroniclers. For a good history of this highly individual monk, see Margarete Vogelgsang, “Der cluniacensische Chronist Rodulfus Glaber” *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 67 (1956): 25–38, 277–97, 71 (1960): 151–85.

¹⁰⁵ Vogelgsang, p. 157.

the monastery of St. Bénigne, Dijon, adopting a mixed Cluniac and Lotharingian way of life for this and other monasteries he eventually was called on to reform.¹⁰⁶

William was dedicated to the separation of monastic life from outside authority. That monks should be left alone to care for themselves, since they were the only ones pure enough to protect monasticism properly, is a central component of William's thought. For example, he described monks as God's sheep and God's personal possession,¹⁰⁷ a view that suggests little trust in the world and a firm belief that monks are really better than the rest of society, including the episcopate. This view explains much of his interest in fighting simony. Monks stand in a special relationship to God. They should not have to suffer infiltration by and irritations from the ungodly. But monks also simply know better, so should not accept the authority of those less spiritually advanced than themselves.

There is little sign of interest in converting the world for the world's sake in accounts of William's life. His main concern was to make the world safe for monks. This concern, however, led him into a great deal of action in the world.¹⁰⁸ William's fears of outside interference in monastic concerns even brought him to open criticism of the papacy. When William founded Fruttuaria in 1001, a northern Italian Benedictine community that soon rose to prominence, he did not place the monastery under the authority of St. Peter, although this might have been expected, considering his Cluniac connections. He was suspicious of such a tie with the pope. Instead, William emphasized that Fruttuaria was to have full freedom, even from papal involvement.¹⁰⁹ William's suspicions were well-grounded. In c. 1024 he considered it necessary to write to the pope, John XIX, to reproach him for selling "spiritual gifts" (*spiritualia dona*) throughout

¹⁰⁶ See Rodulfus Glaber, *Vita Wilhelmi*, passim; see also Hans Heinrich Kaminsky, "Zur Gründung von Fruttuaria durch den Abt Wilhelm von Dijon" *ZKG* 77 (1966): 238–67 for a good overview of William's life.

¹⁰⁷ Rodulfus, *Vita Wilhelmi*, (11): 284; discussed by Hans Kaminsky, "Zur Gründung," p. 265.

¹⁰⁸ Schieffer has suggested that Humbert of Silva Candida, one of the greatest anti-simony spokesmen of the eleventh century, was a disciple of William of Dijon. See Theodor Schieffer, "Cluny et la querelle des Investitures" *RH* 225 (1961): 63. It has further been suggested that Lotharingian criticism of existing relations between Church and king were influenced by William's reform of St. Bénigne and the ideals propagated there. See Hartmut Hoffmann, "Von Cluny zum Investiturstreit" *AJKG* 45 (1963): 186–87.

¹⁰⁹ See Kaminsky, "Zur Gründung," pp. 249, 252.

Italy.¹¹⁰ Clearly, for William, the papacy was in no fit state to try to dictate monastic observance.

The condition of the papacy in the early eleventh century was a public scandal,¹¹¹ but such a clear assertion is nevertheless revolutionary. It was not the role of a monk, abbot or not, to take a pope or any other bishop to task for his improper administration. Many Benedictine monks over the centuries had argued with bishops, ignored them, or even occasionally engaged in theological debates with them. Nevertheless, the issue was almost always episcopal "interference" in the monastery. A monk, even an abbot, simply did not publicly reproach a bishop for how he conducted himself in office. Because William of Dijon was an abbot, it is easy to forget how radical his actions must have appeared to contemporaries. By refusing diaconal ordination from a simonist, he set himself up early in his career as an authority on religious excellence, against both his bishop and his own abbot. With officious monks criticizing their own bishops and taking up tasks such as the Peace of God, it is small wonder that monks drew ever more criticism in the early eleventh century for their arrogance. The issue was not necessarily that they went around snubbing lesser mortals, including bishops. The letters and complaints of men like William, who appeared to have assumed that they had religious rectitude on their side, thanks to their achieving a higher level of asceticism than had other members of the clergy, must have been hard to bear for people raised in the traditional Benedictine assumptions of at least formal withdrawal from the world and humility.

¹¹⁰ Part of the letter is quoted in Rodulfus Glaber, *Vita Wilhelmi*, (10): 280–82. William also wrote to the pope, urging more general reform of the Church. The text of this letter is in Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum*, (IV.3): 174.

¹¹¹ Jules Gay, *Les Papes du XI^e siècle et la chrétienté* (New York, 1974, 1st publication 1926); Klaus-Jürgen Herrmann, *Das Tuskulanerpapsttum (1012–1046)* (Stuttgart, 1973), *passim*.

CHAPTER SIX

MONKS AND THE ROMAN REFORM

In Italy as well as Germany, radical monks taking an active role focused very quickly on the issues of simony and clerical marriage, forming groups that worked for ecclesiastical reform, and anticipating the papal reform movement that began in mid century. Thus the *Liber Tramitis*, a book of monastic customs written between 1015 and 1033, can begin with a statement of the religious ruin of the world, as people denied Christ's precepts, and the devil seemed to be winning the area over completely, especially because of the widespread heresy of simony. Fortunately though, as the author proclaimed, Romuald of Ravenna started a renewal of religious life, a policy that Abbot Hugh of Farfa soon imitated.¹ Interaction with the world by involvement with general questions of religion and Church relations with secular rulers quickly made religious reform a political issue as well as a moral one. This of course complicated matters for the majority of monks who were wary of secular involvements. The papacy began to take an active role in Church reform in 1046, after its own reform by Emperor Henry III. The emperor deposed all three popes who claimed to be the "real" pope, and a series of four German popes was quickly involved in ecclesiastical reform, especially attacking the simony that had plagued Rome itself. Soon groups and individuals of the monastic community associated themselves with papal reforming activity, especially after the ecclesiastical reform began to gain strength with the consecration of Leo IX in 1049. As with more general monastic reform, this interaction between papacy and monasticism crossed the borders between kingdoms and did not draw particularly on either the more conservative reforms such as Gorze and Cluny of the tenth century or the new communities that were being formed in the eleventh century. Historians have attempted to pinpoint the influence of given monastic reform circles, especially trying to stick the label on Cluny as creator of the great eleventh-century

¹ *Liber Tramitis aevi Odilonis abbatis*, ed. Petrus Dinter, CCM 10, (1): 3.

Church reform.² However, there are very slender grounds for such an assignment. Cluny played a secondary role in ecclesiastical reform among both imperial and episcopal monasteries in Germany and Italy, both in touching off the work of ecclesiastical reform, and in involvement with the Investiture Contest. The Cluniacs were rather tepid in their support of Gregory VII. Abbot Hugh himself was relatively active early in the Investiture Contest; he served several times as papal legate and, in his capacity as Henry IV's godfather, was instrumental in the reconciliation between pope and king at Canossa. But Pope Gregory rebuked Hugh several times for his lack of zeal for the papal party. He was, according to the pope, concerning himself too much with affairs at home and not enough with those of the Church, i.e., in support of Gregory's goals.³ Cantor points out that from 1080 on Hugh of Cluny and Gregory VII no longer corresponded, which suggests a breakdown in their relationship.⁴ In general, also, the Cluniacs, located in Burgundy and other areas of France for the most part, were not immediately affected by the warfare between Henry IV and Gregory, and thus did not become overly involved.

The lack of evidence regarding the role of Cluny has led to a variety of interpretations, all of them trying to preserve the greatness of Cluny, some of them sounding more like fantasy than history. Cowdrey argues that tension was rare between pope and Cluny, and that eleventh-century reforming popes consistently regarded Cluniac objectives as compatible with and complementary to their own.⁵ He suggests that Cluny was strong enough to be perceived as dangerous, and that the papacy turned of its own volition to other monasteries for support, especially St. Victor's in Marseilles.

² See H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford, 1970), and Hermann Jakobs' response to Cowdrey, "Die Cluniazenser und das Papsttum im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Bemerkungen zum Cluny-Bild eines neuen Buches" *Francia* 2 (1974): 643-63 for a recent discussion of the issues. Also of interest is Theodor Schieffer's "Cluny et la querelle des Investitures," especially his assessment that Cluny was perhaps the greatest victim of the Investiture Contest, and certainly not a victor. *RH* 225 (1961): 47-72, especially p. 71.

³ See, for example Gregory VII, *Registrum*, MGH Epist. Selectae, (I.62): 90.

⁴ Norman F. Cantor, "The Crisis of Western Monasticism, 1050-1130" *AHR* 66 (1960): 60; Hartmut Hoffmann, "Von Cluny zum Investiturstreit" *AfKG* 45 (1963): 201. Similarly, Gregory criticized Hugh for taking Duke Hugh I of Burgundy as a monk; the duke was a papal supporter, and was needed in the world to support the papacy. Gregory VII, *Registrum*, (VI.17): 423-4.

⁵ Cowdrey, especially pp. 146-155.

The best source of information about monks involved in the papal reform program is again their opponents. This follows the pattern already established in earlier chapters. Again, this is increasingly strong evidence that the monks at the heart of our study, those who were active outside of the monastery, did not themselves feel that they fit into the monastic model of their time. Either that, or, as some evidence hints, the successors of these world-friendly monks were uncomfortable with this side of their founding fathers. Thus, to trace the role of monks in ecclesiastical affairs, our most valuable informant is Peter Damian. As we have already seen with his *Vita Romualdi*, Damian was opposed to secular activity by monks. As far as surviving sources allow one to judge, Damian was probably one of the greatest proponents of a conservative ideal of monasticism to be found in the eleventh century. He was certainly the most outspoken. His position as both a monastic reformer and a cardinal of the Roman Church, besides his elegant prose style, assured that his words would be read and heeded. As we will see, Damian advocated strict adherence to the Benedictine Rule. When he added elements of early monastic spirituality to his monastic theology, only the most world-fleeing elements were allowed. Despite this, he is an invaluable source, because he defended conservative, world-avoiding monasticism against what he saw as wayward and dangerous elements in his own time.

i. *Monks, the reformed papacy, and ecclesiastical reform*

Monasticism in the Empire was not committed as such to the business of ecclesiastical reform, although individuals from some monasteries became involved along with a few whole communities. It is only among the wayward monks who were closely engaged in secular affairs that papal reform appears to have had support at the down-to-earth level among the people. Anti-simonists and preachers of moral reform such as we have examined in the last two chapters found, from 1046 on, that they held many goals in common with the papal reforming party. Yet even then, the individuals and small groups of monks who were active in town and countryside in the Empire were reluctant to accept other authority beyond their own spiritual sense, and their goals sometimes conflicted with those of the papal reformers. Individual monks concerned with the greater cause of ecclesiastical reform also had to face the criticisms of their own natural allies,

the papal reformers, some of whom felt, as had critics for generations, that the place for a monk was in the cloister. Also the two groups lacked coordination, so sometimes active monks working on Church reform found themselves opposed to papal plans, as we will see.

The Investiture Contest was in many ways a turning point in European history.⁶ What has not been sufficiently recognized is that it also marks a major transition in monastic life in the west. This is not because the role monks played for and against the reform movement was new; active monks like the Hirsauer and Vallombrosans had a long pedigree. What was new was the virulence of the critical debate sparked by the Investiture Contest within the ranks of the monastic world. In the course of the battle against simony and the long and bitter struggle between pope and emperor, monks often had to choose one party or the other. Some entered the fray willingly; others were forced by events to make decisions to support one of the sides. Although almost certainly only a minority of monks was involved in the controversy, the ones of whom we know tended to make a major stir, with dramatic actions that caught popular attention. The many facets of monastic participation in both the eleventh and twelfth centuries could not be ignored by the larger religious community, and precipitated both criticism and defense, including defense against those who had sided with them before the cause became too dangerous. In the process of deciding on a norm of behavior, the tension within the Benedictine order became more obvious than it had ever been. Because they were involved in such a central ecclesiastical and political issue, the question of the proper role of monks in relation to the troubles of the society around them became much more pressing to society as a whole, as well as to the monks involved.

The papal reform party itself was largely monastic. Thus both the issues of reform and the debate about the participation of monks among the laity were fought, in the years before the Investiture Contest broke out, largely between monks. At first contemporary writers scarcely noticed that, almost without exception, the leading reformers of the eleventh century had at least been educated in a monastery,

⁶ See Uta-Renate Blumenthal, *The Investiture Controversy* (Philadelphia, 1988); Gerd Tellenbach, *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1993); and Tellenbach's famous study, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest* (Oxford, 1940), just to name a few of the most outstanding works on the subject.

even if they were not monks themselves. After all, the usual habit of the tenth century when a monk entered the ecclesiastical hierarchy, especially as a bishop, was to de-emphasize his monastic antecedents. Of course he remained a monk, but the style of the time was to evaluate him by the values of the episcopate, rather than of Benedictine monasticism. Thus the fact that reform ideas were formed in a monastic context and that the reformers themselves had mental habits that they had learned from the various strains of reform monasticism⁷ did not at first appear significant to observers of the early reform years. To a limited extent these monks who staffed the curia belong to the history of world-embracing monks. They formed much of the theological underpinning of the ecclesiastical reform movement; but they were not down in the trenches with the controversial monks who actually had contact with the laity. Leo IX's closest circle of advisors consisted of monks: Humbert from Moyenmoutier, Hugo Candidus from Remiremont, Hildebrand, Hugh of Cluny, and others were prominent at the papal curia, a situation of monastic prominence that persisted throughout the Investiture Contest.⁸ The election of Nicholas II in 1059 led to an unprecedented run of monk-popes that continued without interruption through the pontificate of Gelasius II, who died in 1119.

All of these monks who were papal reformers were following a long accepted tradition by moving to positions of trust in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. They were buffered from average laymen and women, the very target of the monks of this study. They were, so to say, detached from their monasteries for special assignments in Rome. One should certainly not understate the importance of the intellec-

⁷ See Paulo Brezzi, "Fuga dal mondo e conquista cristiana del mondo nella riforma gregoriana," in *Chiesa e riforma nella spiritualità del sec. XI* (Todi, 1968), p. 17.

⁸ For Hugo Candidus, see Hanns L. Mikoletzky, "Bemerkungen zu einer Vorgeschichte des Investiturstreites" *StGreg* 3 (1948): 260. Other monks important to the Roman reform include Desiderius of Monte Cassino as well as several other Monte Cassino monks, especially during the pontificate of Alexander II. See H.E.J. Cowdrey, *The Age of Abbot Desiderius* (Oxford, 1983), especially pp. 67–68. Guido of Pomposa was an ardent Church reformer, see Donizo, *Vita Mathildis*, MGH SS 12, (I.16): 373; Mikoletzky, "Bemerkungen," p. 245; as was of course Peter Damian, who became prominent in the pontificate of Stephen IX. Cluny also supplied considerable numbers to help with papal business. Hugh of Cluny belonged to the closest circle of Leo IX's fellow workers. See Joachim Wollasch, "Reform und Adel in Burgund," in *Investiturstreit und Reichsverfassung*, ed. Josef Fleckenstein (Sigmaringen, 1973), p. 290. Two of the most active members of the pre-Investiture Contest curia were from Cluny—Stephen of San Grisogono and Gerald of Ostia. They were both used as legates on important missions. See Hoffmann, pp. 200–201.

tual impetus given especially by Lotharingian monks,⁹ but from the start of the ecclesiastical reform movement they were different animals, at a very different level in the hierarchy and popular esteem, one that rarely overlapped with the monks who were actually preaching against simony to the people. These monks provided the reforming popes, especially Gregory VII (1073–1085), with legates, businessmen, and theologians, not with a link to the people.¹⁰

With the papal reform movement, the world-embracing element in monasticism thus came into its own on two different levels: that of theological defense, and that of active preaching and drawing ordinary people into the conflict. Here was a cause that, while it took monks into the world, was conceived and fought in religious terms. Many of these monks read or even wrote the arguments of papal supremacy upon which much of the reform was based—proving at least to themselves that this was a cause one should support in obedience to higher authority. Many things conspired to draw monks into the papal reform. For this study, it is more important to note that other monks, not members of the papal curia, supported Gregory VII in his work to end simony and clerical marriage, and in his conflict with Henry IV. An important part of this work was accomplished by writing. Monks produced fully half of the polemical pamphlets of the reform movement.¹¹ Many other monks not directly

⁹ Hoffmann, p. 187 emphasizes the revolutionary nature of both Burgundian and Lotharingian intellectual life at the time. Raffaello Morghen in *Gregorio VII. e la riforma della Chiesa nel secolo XI*, revised ed. (Palermo, 1974), p. 18 recognizes the contribution of Lotharingia, but argues that the most important element was Roman tradition and knowledge. I believe he underestimates the importance of Lotharingia, since much of the papal curia came from Germany, especially from that territory.

¹⁰ Theodor Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Verträge von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130* (Berlin, 1935), pp. 91, 95–97, 108. Abbot Bertholdus of St. Victor's, Marseilles, was especially important as a legate. See especially Bertholdus, *Annales*, MGH SS 5: 297–98, 323–24. Gerhart B. Ladner, "Gregory the Great and Gregory VII: A Comparison of their Concepts of Renewal" *Viator* 4 (1973): 19 points out that St. Victor of Marseilles was more supportive of the Gregorian conception of renewal than was Cluny.

¹¹ John Van Engen, "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150" *Speculum* 61/2 (1986): 283. Monks joined the struggle on both sides. The most famous monk to write on the imperial side was Siebert of Gembloux (c. 1030–1112). For Siebert, see Ian S. Robinson, "Gregory VII and the Soldiers of Christ" *History* 58 (1973): 171; Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century* (New York, 1978), p. 175. Alois Fauser, *Die Publizisten des Investiturstreites: Persönlichkeiten und Ideen* (Würzburg, 1935), p. 103 describes him as a thorough-going conservative.

involved in the controversy between emperor and pope wrote works permeated with an interest in reform.¹² Nevertheless, for many of the monkish intelligentsia working under the pope, the case of writing about an issue of social concern was in a rather different category of activity from actually going into the world and *doing* something there. It is action, not writing, that created tension within the Benedictine order, as one can see in the reception the active Vallombrosans had when they faced the papal curia.

An important effect when the papacy took over the initiative in ecclesiastical reform was that larger numbers of monks than before joined in. In the process, the action of monks in the world was also politicized. The Roman reforming circle itself was split over the proper way to effect ecclesiastical reform; some bishops joined the movement, while others were condemned as simonists. In some areas reformers had secular support, while in other regions they were vilified. It was no longer simply a case of independent-minded monks who had decided to stretch the rules and go out to save a few souls. By preaching against simony, they became adherents, at least in the popular eye, of the papal party advocating broad reforms in the Church. As such, they were both potentially useful tools and at times major embarrassments to their fellow fighters.

At first the papal forces appear to have welcomed into their ranks the small but vocal movement of monks concerned with the world. At a Roman synod in 1050, Leo IX called specifically on all monks to fight the contamination of the clergy.¹³ This was not simply a case of welcoming any new warrior in the anti-simony campaign. There was a debate within the curia over whether monks should play an active role, especially when, as in preaching, it took them outside of their cloisters. Monks, after all, were supposed to lead lives of quiet

¹² Lampert of Hersfeld and Hugh of Flavigny are good examples. See Jean Leclercq, "L'historiographie monastique de Léon IX. à Callixte II.," in *Il Monachesimo e la riforma ecclesiastica (1049-1122)*, Settimana Mendola 6 (1971), p. 296. Of course, many other monks did their best in their writings to remain neutral in the Investiture Contest; for example, this is true in general of the monks of the Siegburg reform. See Josef Semmler, *Die Klosterreform von Siegburg* (Bonn, 1959), pp. 263-65. Many sources from the late eleventh century do not so much as mention the Investiture Contest or pass over it with only a brief mention, even when the author betrays awareness of the issues. For example, see Conradus, *Vita Wolfhelmi abbatis Brunwilarensis*, MGH SS 12, (introduction): 180.

¹³ Bonizo episcopus Sutri, *Liber ad amicum*, MGH LL 1, (V): 588; see Brunetto Quilici, "Giovanni Gualberto e la sua riforma monastica" *Archivio storico italiano* 99,2; 99,3; 100,1 (1941-2), 3: 55.

retreat; centuries of monastic tradition and interpretation of Benedict of Nursia assured that this would remain the standard view. Gradually, papal supporters also discovered that, although the goals of papal reformers and active monks were similar, they were by no means identical, and in an atmosphere of growing centralization with the pope as the head of Christendom, this became ever less tolerable. The issue was important enough that Pope Alexander II (1061–1073) disapproved of monks preaching against simony and tried to limit the practice,¹⁴ although he was a reformer without sufficient resources to respond to the newly recognized needs of the Church. His successor in turn not only approved of monks publicly engaging in the Investiture Contest, but tried to pressure some communities, most notably Cluny, into playing a larger role.

ii. *Peter Damian vs. the Tuscan hermit*

The case of Tuscany shows what an explosive weapon these irregular troops could be, and how difficult it could be to understand and condone monks who were active in the world. When a synod in 1049 prohibited unchaste clergy from ministering at the altar, it was the signal for a major campaign in which monks played a central role. Bonizo of Sutri, looking back from late in the century, tells how the conflict spread “through neighboring regions and through all of Tuscany, with the aid of monks, religious men who were toiling at preaching the word.”¹⁵ Bonizo leaves the impression, probably mistaken, that the papal decree of 1049 brought these local forces into being. The activities of monks were not instigated by the papal reform movement; rather, papal synods and edicts helped to channel a stance toward improving secular religion that already existed, that we have seen in both Germany and Italy. In Tuscany, this is best known in the case of the Vallombrosans, although it is unlikely that they accounted for all the monastic activities in the region.

Individual hermits probably were responsible for much preaching

¹⁴ Sofia Boesch Gajano, “Storia e tradizione Vallombrosane” *Bullettino dell’istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo* 76 (1964): 178; Giovanni Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo. Studi sull’età Gregoriana* (Rome, 1960), p. 13, note 1.

¹⁵ “sed etiam per vicinas circumquaque regiones et per omnem Tusciam, adiuvantibus monachis, viris religiosis et verbo predicationis insudantibus.” Bonizo, (V): 589; see Gajano, pp. 170–71.

and agitation. We have already seen that they were common in Italy at this time. The greatest opponent of all these men, both monks and hermits, who turned toward the world especially in the cause of Church reform, was Peter Damian (d. 1072), prior of the Camaldolese hermitage/monastery of Fonte Avellana and cardinal bishop of Ostia. His large body of extant writing is one of the best sources on hermits spreading reform ideas in Italy in the eleventh century, since he was so critical of them and so prolific in his letter-writing. Thus, as is so often a research problem for work in the central middle ages, the critics give us the clearest view of events. It is in the problem of the hermit Teuzo of Florence that we get our best look at Damian's views of evangelical hermits and monks. Most of our knowledge of Teuzo comes from Peter Damian's letter to the hermit, written sometime between 1055 and 1057, after Damian had failed to reconcile Teuzo to his abbot. This is one of the harshest of Damian's many letters, and exposes as does no other the radical break he and his followers of Fonte Avellana had made from Romuald's original Camaldolesi. It also reveals Peter Damian's understanding of the process of ecclesiastical reform.

Teuzo was a monk of La Badia in Florence. After a quarrel with his abbot, Teuzo withdrew from the monastery, but he did not follow any of the steps Peter Damian would have considered proper in such a situation. He did not enter another monastery, nor did he join one of the more stringent congregations of hermits. Instead, Teuzo became a recluse attached to his original monastery in the center of Florence.

Peter Damian distinguishes between two types of hermits. The first are good, honest, Fonte Avellana-style hermits: they live in cells in a community, under the direction of a spiritual advisor. The second are anchorites, who go out to the desert to live in solitude. As Damian bluntly points out, *holy* anchorites occur rarely or never in the times in which they live.¹⁶ Clearly Teuzo was a deficient anchorite. In either

¹⁶ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #50, 2: 84, in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, MGH Briefe, emphasis mine. See Bernard Hamilton, "S. Pierre Damien et les mouvements monastiques de son temps" *StGreg* 10 (1975): 188. Leclercq argues in his "'Eremus' et 'eremita.'" Pour l'histoire du vocabulaire de la vie solitaire" *Collectanea ordinis Cisterciensium reformatorum* 25 (1963): 25 that the distinction between these two sorts of solitaries was rare and artificial. I make no claims for the overall popularity of this distinction; only for its presence in Peter Damian's own thought. It is interesting to note that Owen Blum in his recent translation of this letter left out the word "holy" completely, leaving the text to read "anchorites occur rarely or never," in other

case a hermit ought to live in solitude, far from the temptations of the world.

That of course is the problem with Teuzo, according to Peter. He has made the mistake of leading an eremitical life among the people of Florence, instead of in a hermitage where weak-willed mortals belong, far from the pollution of the laity. Peter is adamant: the proper life of a hermit is one of silence and penitence.¹⁷ It is worth quoting Peter's comments on Teuzo's central location at length:

But I ask you, if you are a monk, what do you have to do with cities? If you are a hermit, what are the crowds of a city to you? What sort of cells or walls or outside rules give you protection? Indeed, what else can be thought of those who seek solitude in cities instead of under the trees, except that they are more concerned with the favor of the crowd and glory than with the perfection of the solitary life?

Peter goes on to say that in such a situation, one listens to the voice of the crowds, rather than to one's own conscience. Rough, irreligious city-dwellers are also likely to see as extraordinary holiness behavior that should be part of every monk's or hermit's life. For example, although it is downright "ignoble" to drink wine in a hermitage, in the city it is considered a prodigy to abstain; a hair shirt in the hermitage is a garment, while in the city it is a spectacle.¹⁸

This mixture of two worlds—the silence of the hermitage and the bustle of the city—is not the only reason Peter Damian is so vitriolic against Teuzo (besides, perhaps, a level of personal antagonism between the two). Damian's major complaint, which shows him clearly as an opponent of popular reform preaching, at least in one common form, is about how Teuzo spends his time. His life is not one of quiet retreat, nor is it one of drunken dissoluteness, which Peter might have been better able to understand, since his reform work led him to deal with monks and hermits who simply did not live up to the basic tenets of their Rule. Instead, Teuzo claimed that he was

words taking Peter to mean that this form of life was extinct. Peter Damian, *Letters*, #50; trans. Owen Blum, *The Fathers of the Church, Mediaeval Continuation* (Washington, D.C., 1990), 2: 293.

¹⁷ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #44, 2: 26.

¹⁸ "Sed, quaeso, si monachus es, quid tibi cum urbibus? Si heremita, quid tibi cum civium cuneis? Quid enim cellae vel fora strepentia vel turrita conferunt propugnacula? Enimvero qui tamquam deficientibus silvis solitudinem in urbibus quaerunt, quid aliud credendum est, nisi quia solitariae vitae non perfectionem, sed favorem potius et gloriam aucupantur?" *Ibid.*, p. 13.

living a holy life, but nevertheless became embroiled in the most burning issue of the day: the ecclesiastical struggle against simony. He had apparently left his own monastery because the abbot was a simonist, and soon established himself as a master advisor on simony for others. Instead of giving himself some legitimacy by working as a monastic reformer, Teuzo devoted himself to the single cause of ecclesiastical reform. Several other sources comment on his unremitting stand against simony. For example, all of the hagiographers of John Gualbert, the founder of Vallombrosa, agree that John, after he left his simoniacal monastery, went to Teuzo for advice. The advice he received was so inflammatory that it led to John's public denunciation of his abbot.¹⁹ Teuzo became very famous as a spiritual advisor; many came to ask for his prayers, but also for his advice on the religious issues of the day. Indeed, he was so famous that Emperor Henry III came to him for counsel and friendship, according to one of the *vitae* of John,²⁰ and documents of both Konrad II and Henry IV list him as an intercessor. The second document dates from 1073, showing that he prospered a long time in spite of the weight of Peter Damian's attack.²¹ Quilici also suggests that both Konrad II and Henry III asked for his prayers, as for those of other great holy men of the time.²²

While all contact with the laity met with Peter's disapproval, it was the public propaganda against simony that was the focus of Peter's letter. Teuzo is a hermit, but his public speech on ecclesiastical reform makes him a bad one. There are several reasons for this, according to the rules Peter holds appropriate for professional religious. Hermits, argues Peter, should be humble, not contentious. They should not spend their time in sermonizing. Teuzo does not even have the excuse of edifying his listeners, but instead just speaks interminably.²³ An added disturbance was Teuzo's involvement in anti-

¹⁹ See especially Andreas Strumensi, *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*, MGH SS 30,2, (8): 1081 and Atto, *Vita s. Joannis Gualberti*, PL 146, (9): 675. All the *vitae* of John Gualbert are also careful to refer to Teuzo as a recluse, giving him the proper title for a religious solitary within a city, and placing him within the tradition of spiritual advice expected of a recluse. See Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (41): 1089; Atto, (36): 683; *Vita Iohannis Gualberti auctore discipulo eius anonymo*, MGH SS 30,2, (1): 1105.

²⁰ Anonymous, *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*, (1): 1105.

²¹ Werner Goetz, "Reformpapsttum, Adel und monastische Erneuerung in der Toscana," in Fleckenstein, ed., p. 230, note 130. The documents are KII #273 and HIV #262a.

²² Quilici, "Giovanni Gualberto," p. 38.

²³ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #44, 2: 9.

simony campaigns—always inquiring about who had ordained priests and bringing up other awkward questions. With his interminable questions, Peter rages, Teuzo has put the world into confusion, has created a tempest on his own, and since he himself does not know peace, Teuzo will not permit others to live in tranquillity. He is also arrogantly assuming the right to judge others, overstepping the proper limits of his position, whether he is viewed as a monk or a hermit, or even an anchorite. This again suggests that Teuzo played a very active role, and his questions threw Damian into a passion.²⁴ Although Damian ends by asking for Teuzo's prayers, it is impossible to believe that he saw much of sanctity in his way of life.²⁵

I believe that the heart of Peter Damian's complaint lies in two areas: the traditional criticism that Teuzo was too involved in the world for a monk, an involvement against which Damian fought on more than one occasion, and the more specific problem of unregulated preaching on such a sensitive issue as simony. Peter did not believe, as did the followers of John Gualbert, that it was possible to live a holy life in a large city "for there is no place that is not remote for those who have compunction of mind," as one of John Gualbert's followers defends his master.²⁶ Teuzo is guilty of too much compunction on too fragile a ground. When Damian calls Teuzo inept in his teaching, he states that such ineptness often leads to heresy and schism, a very telling comment about how Peter Damian viewed the offense.²⁷ He is clearly referring to Teuzo's views on the heresy of simony, suggesting that Teuzo had been teaching his followers that the sacrament of an improperly ordained priest was not valid. That was indeed the case with Teuzo's disciples, John Gualbert and his followers.²⁸ Peter, as a papal advisor, could see the anti-simony program dissolving into a mass of confusion and heresy. This was an issue into which Peter put enormous time and energy. He argued in such treatises as his *Liber Gratissimus*²⁹ that it is God who

²⁴ Ibid., 2: 32.

²⁵ Ibid., 2: 33.

²⁶ "quia nullus locus est non remotus compunctae menti." Anonymous, *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*, (1): 1105.

²⁷ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #44, 2: 27. Already in the *Liber Gratissimus* (Letter 40), written in 1052, Peter states that one cannot go elsewhere to receive the sacraments from a priest who is free of simony. 1: 466.

²⁸ See Atto, *Vita Joannis Gualberti*, (23): 680, which strongly suggests this stand. Peter Damian accuses the Vallombrosans of this in *Briefe*, #146, 3: 533.

²⁹ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #40, 1: 384–509. Peter himself named the treatise *Liber*

gives the sacrament, no matter how flawed the instrument. This stand only gradually won the approval of the ecclesiastical reform circle, mostly thanks to the persuasiveness and erudition of Peter Damian himself. He had to compete against more hotheaded reformers in the curia itself, such as Humbert of Silva Candida, who wished to declare the sacraments of simoniacs invalid.³⁰ So for Peter, to speak without proper instruction could lead to catastrophe in the fragile world of the early ecclesiastical reform, and Teuzo, while he argued for reform, was too inflammatory. It is also unlikely that he was a highly trained theologian, and the subtleties of simoniacal ordination were probably beyond his competence. If he had taken a less radical stand, Peter might have been more understanding. Yet one still cannot avoid Peter's basic conviction that professional religious, the most available source of workers for the reform cause, were separate from the cares of the *ecclesia* in general. In this, as in all matters, they were dead to the world.

In this letter, though, we find Peter caught on the horns of his own dilemma. In the prologue to Teuzo, Peter says that he ought not speak, but that speaking in censure is better than remaining silent and letting wrong actions take place uncontested.³¹ This displays Peter Damian's own moral tightrope. He was a monk, a reformed hermit, and yet had been forced into a bishopric and cardinalate that involved him in all the issues of the world. He faced with particularly poignant intensity the same problem that Pope Gregory I had confronted long before and to which Teuzo supplied his own answer: how can a contemplative help in the needs of the world? Peter comes down with a simple answer that almost completely bars professional religious from engaging in ecclesiastical reform activities; it is next to impossible to lead both the active and contemplative lives together. Peter is an anomaly, as he himself was well aware, trapped by obedience to the papacy in activity he thought improper to his profession. In the letter to Teuzo, Damian tells of a fellow monk caught in the same contradiction, who "... often worked for the necessities of the churches, or to make peace treaties, which I personally know very well to be detrimental, although others con-

Gratissimus, which marks it as his central statement on the sacraments. Note 1, p. 384.

³⁰ This is the general thrust of Humbert of Silva Candida's argument in his *Libri III adversus simoniacos*, MGH LL 1: 95–253. See Jean Leclercq, "Simoniaca heresis" *StGreg* 1 (1947): 527.

³¹ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #44, 2: 8.

sider it proper to proceed in this way. . . ." This monk did well because of his holy simplicity, a skill unquestionably not sharpened by contact with the world and one that the arrogant Teuzo certainly lacked. In general, the various groups of religious, monks and hermits alike, are meant to enlighten others, but Peter asks out of his deep weariness, "How can a candle provide light for others, when it has been consumed in the flame?"³² Monks, like candles, must remain separate to avoid being devoured alive by the flames of the world.

Peter sums up much of his understanding of good versus evil in the religious life in his late letter 165, written in 1069 to the hermits Albizo and Peter. It is not surprising that the old *Patrologia Latina* edition should have entitled this long letter "*Apologeticum de contemptu saeculi*."³³ This letter sums up the mature Peter Damian's views on the life of professional religious. In this treatise, Peter makes it abundantly clear that it is not the business of either a monk or a hermit to have dealings with the world. Specific statements deal with the avoidance of all worldly obligations, such as that one should have no contact with relatives and should give no heed to worldly vanities.³⁴ The only proper course for a monk or a hermit is to stay firmly mewed up in his cloister. For, as he says, "Custom makes the monk's cell sweet, while wandering makes it appear horrible. For wanderers the cell is a prison, for those who remain in stability it is a delightful chamber."³⁵ "Vagabond" monks, like Isaac's son Esau in the Genesis story (Gen 27.13–30), lose the blessing that stay-at-homes like Jacob received.³⁶ What is more, they risk a spiritual defilement, such as that prefigured by Dinah, who went out among strangers only to be raped (Gen 34).³⁷ One may wonder why Peter addressed this treatise to two hermits. The most logical answer I can find is that perhaps they, like Damian himself, were tempted by the lure of ecclesiastical

³² "Saepe rogatus, ut pro necessitatibus aecclesiasticis vel foederanda pace procederem, cum mihi detrimentum esse pernoscere, licet aliis proveniret. . . ." "Quid," inquit, "candelae prodest, si aliis luceat, dum se interim edax flamma consumat?" Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #44, 2: 16.

³³ Petrus Damiani, op. 12, PL 145: 251–92.

³⁴ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 203.

³⁵ "Consuetudo enim facit monacho cellulam dulcem, vagatio videri facit horribilem. Vagantibus cellula carcer est, permanentibus suave cubiculum." Ibid., 4: 211.

³⁶ Ibid., 4: 203–4.

³⁷ Ibid., 4: 202.

reform. Certainly the letter brings up the issue of would-be salutary action in the world.

Peter sees both monks and hermits in this light. In letter 165, he calls wandering hermits among the worst of those who fall from their vows. He tells of hermits who stay in their cells only during Lent, wandering the rest of the time, "and thus pass their lives worthlessly" (*et sic vitam suam inaniter spatiando consumunt*). They cannot ascend to the beatific vision, since anyone who wants to attain to that inaccessible light must first cleanse his interior eyes from all mundane things.³⁸ Indeed, *all* clerics, not just professional religious, should flee from the oppression of dealing with the laity. The reason is simple: one must be pure to minister at the altar, and clerics are polluted by associating with evil people, who are unavoidable in contemporary society.³⁹ Thus the danger of dealing with excommunicates alone should be sufficient to keep a religious from breaking his stability.⁴⁰ In many ways, Peter is trying to return to the ideal monastic life of the early tenth century, if not of the fourth.

iii. *The quandary of ecclesiastical reform*

There has been some debate over whether Peter Damian believed that a life of mixed action and contemplation was possible. Bultot argued strongly that Damian saw an unbridgeable gap between the two.⁴¹ Hamilton, on the other hand, argues that Bultot has seriously overstated the case, although without providing much evidence.⁴² Ferretti points to several areas in Peter Damian's own work in which he speaks of the unity of the active and contemplative lives,⁴³ but

³⁸ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 210. In *Briefe*, #27, 1: 244 Peter compares the food gathered in meditation to manna, tasting like honey.

³⁹ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #39, 1: 383.

⁴⁰ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 192.

⁴¹ Robert Bultot, *La Doctrine du mépris du monde*. Vol. 4: *Le XI^e siècle*. Part 1: *Pierre Damien* (Louvain, 1963), p. 13.

⁴² Hamilton suggests that Peter Damian was not basically a pessimist in regard to the world. He reaches the conclusion that Damian was not really interested in the salvation of the individual soul, but in the work of the Church. Hamilton, see especially p. 201.

⁴³ Walter Ferretti, "Il posto dei laici nella Chiesa secondo San Pier Damiani," in *San Pier Damiano nel IX centenario della morte (1072-1972)* (Cesena, 1972), 1: 247, 257. Ferretti also criticizes Bultot for too great a rigidity in his analysis. Ferretti, p. 250, note 13.

without, I believe, taking into proper account the recipients of the letters in question. In general, there exists at best a tension for Peter Damian between the active and contemplative lives, as he implies in his letter 27 to the clerics of Fano, probably written before 1059.⁴⁴ By the end of his life, as seen in letter 165, living a mixed life of contemplation and action is simply not possible for a monk—neither one will be productive, and one will corrupt the other.⁴⁵ In one of his more telling passages, Damian describes a rotten world, lacking in decency or honesty, in which vice and depravity are growing.⁴⁶

The problem of defining sequestration as being for one's own good and that of others is that it was becoming fragmented at the edges in the early eleventh century. Peter Damian himself was trapped by papal command into becoming the cardinal bishop of Ostia, and found himself on a round of legations and services to the papacy that chafed him very badly, and from which he regularly begged to be excused.⁴⁷ Of course Peter Damian was an exception, though. As prior of Fonte Avellana he did not entirely escape the mold of the abbot in the service of secular or religious authorities. As he was a brilliant writer and theologian, someone was bound to demand his services. But in this light it is most peculiar that Peter Damian started his own personal fight against simony and other abuses in the Church on his own initiative, rather than working with a group.⁴⁸ It was only chance that made him "respectable," able to claim superior authority as justification for conducting himself with what he himself regarded as grave impropriety in others. Whatever his misgivings, Damian's work for ecclesiastical reform came from an individual impulse, most likely a feeling that *someone* had to take a stand and that he was well-equipped by his education and his contemplative life to do so, as was the case of other monastic reformers who turned to the greater ecclesiastical reform with greater experience and skill.

I believe that Peter Damian was so vehement in his rejection of

⁴⁴ Giovanni Miccoli, "Pier Damiani e la vita comune del clero," in *La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI e XII*, Settimana Mendola 3 (1962), 1: 187–88.

⁴⁵ On this interpretation, see Giovanni Miccoli, "Théologie de la vie monastique chez Saint Pierre Damien" *Théologie de la vie monastique* 49 (1961): 477; Brezzi, p. 20; and more generally Jean Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église* (Rome, 1960), p. 140.

⁴⁶ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #86, 2: 461.

⁴⁷ See for example Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #72, 2: 326–66.

⁴⁸ Fridolin Dressler, *Petrus Damiani. Leben und Werk*, *StAns* 34 (Rome, 1954), pp. 94–95.

Teuzo, and an undisclosed number of people like him, for two compelling reasons: Peter Damian could not conceive of a productive religious life that was not conducted in solitude, besides which, as we have seen, he feared the dangers of unauthorized preaching in the sensitive area of reforming ecclesiastical politics. To him the drawing line was not between professed religious and dangerous innovators, but between those religious who stayed at home and those, either singly or in groups, who went out voluntarily into the world. Worst of all, the note of urgency in Peter Damian's letters and scattered remarks by others suggest that the numbers who fit in this category were increasing, and caused Damian grave alarm.

This is most obvious in his attacks on Vallombrosa, a monastery founded by the vagabond monk John Gualbert after he had abandoned his monastery to get away from his simonist abbot. As we will see, the Vallombrosans were the active carriers to the world of Teuzo's ecclesiastical revolt. From Peter Damian's attacks, we can trace at least the outline of a story of both individual hermits and at least a few monastic communities going into the world to preach the cause of reform for the Church. Peter's words are too harsh and too specific for one to take them simply as a *topos*, drawing a contrast with the ideal religious life. Again, letter 165, not addressed to any particular group working on ecclesiastical reform, alerts us to the depth of the problem. Repeatedly Peter warns monks to avoid snares in the form of action in the world. Mary is better than Martha, as Moses surpasses Aaron. Even religious who set out with good intentions risk shipwreck in the maelstrom of the world. As he tells his brethren, our job, in the dark night of this life, we who are on the beach, is to put up a light to guide ships, so they can see the right course and reach port, "not, however, that we, going out to them, should be sucked up in the whirlpool of the foaming sea."⁴⁹ If a monk wants to attain perfection, Peter repeats, he should stay in the cloister and occupy himself with spiritual things. He certainly will not do anyone any good by immersing himself in the lake of blood that constitutes the world, where he will be more contaminated every day.⁵⁰

The audience of the lessons in letter 165 is good hermits, whom

⁴⁹ "non autem nos ad eos transfretante vorago spumosi maris absorbeat." Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 214.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 4: 225.

Peter addresses respectfully and indeed with affection. Nevertheless, the tenor of the letter suggests that even these men think they will do good by venturing into the world and believe they can effect change specifically by preaching. While allowing for the fact that Peter was trying to discourage this particular group in society from reform preaching, his views are so negative that it is hard to believe that he saw ecclesiastical reform as possible before the Second Coming. Preaching, he states, is no longer effective. In former times preaching was fruitful, but not now. Modern people hear crowds of preachers and are not convinced, while one man converted Nineveh. Now it is not even possible to convert one man away from an illicit marriage, despite two papal councils in the very year he writes. A monk can desert his religious life "under the pretense" of saving souls, only to waste his efforts in barrenness. His words will not affect simoniacs, he will not be able to restore people to their rightful inheritances, bring about peace on battlefields, or accomplish anything else praiseworthy. "Everything in the world is in confusion, and all rules of piety and faith are overthrown."⁵¹ These evangelical monks and hermits only add to the problem.

Certainly monks and hermits were going out to preach, and Peter Damian was doing his best to stop it, calling on all his formidable arsenal of biblical knowledge, centuries of monastic tradition, and rhetoric. Professional religious, interfering in the world, always act "under the pretense" (*sub specie*) of trying to help.⁵² Peter implies by his language that the problem was actually itchy feet and a desire for excitement and notoriety. It is great audacity for a monk to preach, as can be seen from the fact that Paul forbade it to Timothy in better circumstances than now exist (2 Tim 3).⁵³

iv. *The evidence of Vallombrosa*

The monks of Vallombrosa shared with hermits such as Teuzo in Peter Damian's censure. Vallombrosan interest in the world started well before the papal reform. John Gualbert, who founded the mother

⁵¹ "Omnia in orbe confusa, cuncta pietatis ac fidei decreta convulsa." Ibid., 4: 218–21. Quotation on p. 221.

⁵² Ibid., 4: 221, 223.

⁵³ Ibid., 4: 222.

house of the congregation in c. 1036, had an early reform approach very similar to that of a William of Dijon or Romuald of Ravenna. He made an adult conversion to the monastic life, joining the Florentine monastery of San Miniato shortly before 1035. Soon he became discontented with this community, mainly because of conflict with the new abbot, who had purchased his office. John went to Teuzo for advice on what to do; he felt that he could not live properly under a simoniac. Teuzo told John to denounce both the abbot and the bishop of Florence publicly as simoniacs, a course the aspiring reformer followed with such vigor that he had to flee the city. John decided after that formally to break his ties with his tainted monastery and search for another community in which proper religious life was upheld.⁵⁴

Vallombrosan historians of course justify the foundation of their mother house on the grounds that no monastery was good enough for their founder—a standard topos in monastic foundation stories for centuries. In reality, John was in no hurry to settle down again. We see the familiar pattern of a monk setting himself up as an authority in opposition to his superiors, probably thanks to the already established opinion that simony is heresy, and cannot be condoned. John Gualbert was a member of the second generation of monks who took such a stand—he went to the recluse Teuzo, who had himself abandoned his monastery on the same grounds. The final step of the process was that John joined the rabble of vagabonds, gyrovague monks and hermits, disreputable, and viewed askance even by other reforming groups.

For we must always remember that not all reformers shared the same goals or ideals. Regarding northern Italy, Vallombrosans and Camaldolesi are often lumped together in discussions of eleventh-century reforming movements. Yet already in the 1030's Camaldoli was setting itself up in reaction to the wandering and concern for the world that are most representative of John Gualbert and his early followers, as well as of their own founder, Romuald of Ravenna. In

⁵⁴ John Gualbert was probably born in c. 995, so was already middle-aged when he left the monastery. The best general analysis of John Gualbert's life and work is Quilici; see pp. 124–25 for his probable age and year of birth; for details about his conflict with the simoniac abbot Uberto, see pp. 47–49. See Gajano, pp. 99–215 for a very interesting analysis of the value of the *vitae* of John Gualbert as historical sources. Gajano discusses Teuzo's influence on John. See especially pp. 148, 153. See also Goetz, p. 230 for John's preaching against his abbot and bishop.

the course of his wanderings, John Gualbert reached Camaldoli. According to his hagiographers, he eventually refused to join the community, despite the prior's urging. This is a pleasant story that preserves the appearances of an ideal monk in an ideal monastic world. But Gajano's suggestion that John did not remain long at Camaldoli because the prior disapproved of him as a gyrovague fits better into the pattern of what we know about the monastery and the man.⁵⁵ John eventually moved on to Vallombrosa, about half a day's journey from Florence, and established a hermitage. By 1048 at the latest, the community had adopted the Benedictine Rule.⁵⁶

The early history of Vallombrosa contains a curious dichotomy. On one hand, historians such as Knowles have suggested that Vallombrosa was the first eleventh-century monastery to interpret the Benedictine Rule in the strict sense.⁵⁷ Certainly the earliest sources on the monastery, mostly from the end of the eleventh century, emphasize an ideal Benedictine observance that follows the same patterns laid down by the Anianian reform. If one is to believe these accounts, John Gualbert appears to have legislated a carefully stable monastic lifestyle, including enough restrictions on extra-claustral activity to make even a recluse happy. Except in cases of great need, monks were not supposed to set foot outside of the cloister. Also according to the earliest *vita*, Gualbert's monks were forbidden to accept the gift of chapels, on the ground that the care of such places was appropriate work for canons, not monks. Monks also ought never live in twos or threes away from the community.⁵⁸

Several anecdotes in the three *vitae* of the Vallombrosan founder appear at first impression to bear out this picture of a community of monks living in quiet isolation from the world. Both Andreas and Atto relate with pride that the first monks at Vallombrosa included an exceptionally fervent monk named Erizo, who was so committed to stability that he remained on the hill where the monastery was built, not even descending to the villages in the valley below.⁵⁹ One

⁵⁵ Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (10): 1082; Atto, *Vita s. Joannis Gualberti*, (11): 675–76. Gajano, p. 156, note 3.

⁵⁶ See Denis Meade, "From Turmoil to Solidarity: The Emergence of the Vallombrosan Monastic Congregation" *ABR* 19 (1968), pp. 329–30 on the eremitical beginnings of Vallombrosa.

⁵⁷ David Knowles, *From Pachomius to Ignatius: A Study in the Constitutional History of the Religious Orders* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 18–19.

⁵⁸ Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (19): 1085; Atto, (20): 679.

⁵⁹ Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (12): 1083; Atto, (13): 676.

of John's disciples was praised in a similar vein: he read day and night, even while riding, which clearly showed to contemporaries his great separation from interest in worldly matters.⁶⁰ There is also a tale that when a pope (either Leo or Stephen; the accounts vary) was traveling in the vicinity of Vallombrosa, he sent for John Gualbert. Instead of attending upon the pope himself, John sent one of the monastery's lay brothers in his place. The pope, according to the story, saw this as proof of John's sanctity and gave him his blessing "to remain quietly in the monastery."⁶¹

Even these stories of stable life contain some questionable elements. Why was it especially praiseworthy that a monk should not gad about in the villages near Vallombrosa? What was John's disciple doing out riding, even with his nose in a book? Looked at more closely, this appears as a statement of spiritual distancing, rather than physical separation from the world. As such, it falls much more into the camp of the monks concerned with secular society than of traditional Benedictines. Even the self-consciousness of the tale of John's refusal to attend upon the pope suggests at the very least that the hagiographer was trying to make his subject conform to an ideal notion of Benedictinism in which an important defining characteristic was physical stability. To do so, he had to ignore other important characteristics of the ideal Benedictine monk, such as humility and obedience, which would probably have been the decisive elements for a tenth-century abbot who did not want to obey a papal summons.

These stories thus only imperfectly mask that the Benedictinism practiced by John Gualbert and his early followers included significant departures from traditional Benedictine ideals and leave an escape clause: that they should leave the monastery only in cases of great need. The stories do set up a dichotomy of a normal life of strict, contemplative withdrawal, which, rather than being an end in itself, was preparation for action in the world. Already in 1049 the Vallombrosans as a group appear to have played a role in the anti-simony demonstrations that so affected Tuscany that they were still

⁶⁰ Atto, (33): 682.

⁶¹ "Nolo illum ultra ad me venire, sed in cenobio cum Dei benedictione quiete manere." Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (45): 1090; Atto, (42): 685. Leclercq has argued that a firm obligation for Vallombrosans to remain within the monastery dates back to John. See Jean Leclercq, "La crise du monachisme aux XI^e et XII^e siècles" *Bullettino dell'istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo* 70 (1958): 27; Jean Leclercq, *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale* (Paris, 1964), p. 184.

remembered a generation later. The earliest Vallombrosan legislation explicitly recognized the ability of monks to preach outside of the monastery, although only in particular emergency situations. This meant, as we can see it through the filters of the hagiographical tradition, primarily the struggle against the heresy of simony.⁶²

In a brilliant article, Gajano has suggested that the hagiographer Andreas of Strumi insisted so forcefully on Vallombrosan adherence to the Benedictine Rule as an answer to charges of innovation laid against the congregation, especially by Peter Damian, the greatest critic of monks acting in the world of his age. In other words, this careful enunciation of Benedictine values actually was not central to John Gualbert's own thought.⁶³ Such an explanation would certainly make more sense of the inconsistencies of the hagiographical accounts. It would also bridge the gap between John Gualbert's earlier life and the activities in which he and fellow Vallombrosans engaged. If the hagiographer was guilty of stripping away references to active roles played by monks, except for their relatively acceptable involvement in the papally-sponsored reform, the Vallombrosans also fit better into the tradition of wandering hermits and preachers examined in this study.

Humbert of Silva Candida had a notable affinity toward the Vallombrosans, doubtless at least in part because they shared a common vision of simony, according to which the sacraments were invalid if consecrated by an impure simonist.⁶⁴ In 1058 Humbert dedicated the newly finished church at Vallombrosa, a clear sign of patronage.⁶⁵ Hildebrand, both as a member of the curia and in office as Pope Gregory VII was their most outspoken supporter. He approved of Vallombrosa's stand against the simoniacal bishop of Florence, and did not seem to care what methods were employed as long as they gave positive results.⁶⁶ As pope he gave many privileges to the Vallombrosan monasteries, and showed his friendship for John Gualbert by celebrating a special requiem mass for him.⁶⁷ This division

⁶² See Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo*, pp. 12-13; Goez, pp. 231-32.

⁶³ Gajano, p. 163.

⁶⁴ For Humbert's views, see Humbertus, *Libri III adversus simoniacos*, passim. See Quilici 3: 68 on Humbert's friendship for and patronage of Vallombrosa.

⁶⁵ Yoram Milo, "Tuscany and the Dynamics of Church Reform in the Eleventh Century" (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1979), p. 179.

⁶⁶ Gajano, p. 177.

⁶⁷ Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo*, p. 148; Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (85): 1102.

within the curia over the Vallombrosan position created a clear problem, and one that is still common among historians trying to understand what the Church reformers wanted. The intellectuals of the ecclesiastical reform movement were in the process of defining the ideal of *ecclesia*, and this formulation of doctrine slowly sank to the lower ranks of society. It is not surprising that a clear-cut stand of "bad priest, don't get sacraments from him" would make more sense to people, then and now, than an argument that the sacraments are still valid, even if administered by unworthy hands, but that one shouldn't deal with a simoniacal clergyman as a matter of ecclesiastical discipline.

There is of course no reason to assume that the early Vallombrosans were always consistent, at least in patterns that are obvious to us. Even if they felt that the need of the world called them to an active role in secular affairs, the normal life of the monks could indeed have been predicated upon separation from the world. That is at the heart of why it was most often reformed monks who became involved in the affairs of the world. Because of their separation, such monks gained a moral superiority that made it possible for them to reenter the world, to intervene from their place near God. The world was still a dangerous and evil place; it was only because of their detachment that monks like the Vallombrosans could intervene with a hope of survival. The monastic life was still a permanent commitment and a refuge from secular society. Thus we find a story of a lay brother who (led by the devil, of course) repented having left the world. John Gualbert very properly would not allow him to leave the monastic life. The unwilling young man finally fell off a cliff and died. The hagiographer tells the story to show the danger of even wanting to leave the monastery.⁶⁸ That a religious life should be based in some way upon separation from the world was still unquestioned; the issue was to what use monks should put the virtue gained by that means.

The tale of Vallombrosa's reform efforts has been studied at length, and we need not dwell upon it here. In this context, the most important point is that John Gualbert and his followers attracted so much attention that they became a center of inspiration for other monks and of controversy on the monastic life. The first chapter of Atto's *vita* of John begins with a statement that the hero grew up

⁶⁸ Atto, (44): 686; Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (49): 1090.

"in the days when the heresies of simony and nicolaitism were polluting Tuscany and indeed all Italy. . . ."⁶⁹ All accounts of John's life agree that the founder of Vallombrosa dedicated much of his life to the fight for ecclesiastical reform, rather than to particularly monastic reform, although he was of course a monastic founder. The accounts also agree that both fame and a considerable degree of success attended his efforts.⁷⁰ John Gualbert's anonymous hagiographer describes John as the "prince" (*princeps*) in the fight against simony,⁷¹ which certainly suggests that he worked as part of a group. In fact, Andreas recounts that monks left their monasteries and made long pilgrimages to see John Gualbert. Gajano has pointed out that, to contemporary eyes, John Gualbert probably appeared as the moving spirit in the anti-simony struggle, rising from monastic reform to become a leader of ecclesiastical reform.⁷²

Such a visible center for agitation naturally became a focus for monks who were discontented with the traditional parameters of their own lives. Some came, as monks had approached reform leaders for centuries, to learn how to lead a praiseworthy life; others, however, came to discover from John how to avoid the pollution of simony.⁷³ Vallombrosa's fame rested on not one but two foundations: it was a center of monastic reform for Tuscany and was recognized as a center for the more general moral reform of the Church. It is clear from their activities that Gualbert's followers shared his views about activity in the world, at least on the issue of simony.

v. *A community of reformers*

Tuscan monks, probably Vallombrosans, preached as early as 1050 that incelibate priests should be suspended from their offices.⁷⁴ Soon a group, clearly made up of John and his disciples, focused their

⁶⁹ "Tempore quo Simoniaca et Nicolaitarum haereses per Tusciam et pene per totam Italiam . . . foedabant. . . ." Atto, (1): 671.

⁷⁰ For example, see Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (68): 1094, (78): 1100; *Vita Iohannis Gualberti anonymo*, (3): 1106.

⁷¹ *Vita anonymo*, (4): 1106.

⁷² Gajano, 109.

⁷³ Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (68): 1094. Gajano, p. 109. His activities certainly far exceeded the propaganda for Church reform of St. Nilus and Romuald of Ravenna. See Quilici, p. 30.

⁷⁴ Bonizo, (VI): 590; see Milo, pp. 156–57.

attacks on Peter Mezzabarba, the bishop of Florence, whom they accused of simony. This opposition not only took passive forms such as letter-writing, but included public preaching, and, according to their critics, fomenting revolt. The first evidence of Vallombrosa's campaign against Bishop Peter Mezzabarba is an appeal to the emperor against him in 1062, which both Italian and French sources reported.⁷⁵ By 1064 the monks had certainly taken the pulpit against their bishop: Pope Alexander II wrote a letter in that year, ordering an unnamed group of monks to stop preaching, almost certainly John Gualbert's followers, since they are described as a group, and there is no extant evidence for any other groups of monks active at the time. The pope quoted against them the authority of the Council of Chalcedon (451) that monks should not wander about in cities.⁷⁶

Alexander's letter is a valuable clue suggesting how active monks at the local level fit into the world of Church reform in the mid-eleventh century. These monks were doing good work for the papal reformers. This effort of an organized, accredited monastery to oust its own bishop attracted wide attention to the issue of simony, especially after the outraged bishop's bloody attempts to suppress his opposition in an attack on St. Salvi, a Vallombrosan monastery in Florence. The monks' goals and that of the pope seem to correspond. And yet the pope ordered them to stop preaching. What is more, when ordered to be silent and return to their cloisters, the Vallombrosans refused to do so. They were not an arm of the papal reform; the papacy's disapproval would not stop them in what they apparently saw as a quite independent crusade.

Alexander II was not in the habit of turning away possible supporters; he was an ardent and intelligent reformer himself, and gathered an impressive circle of reformers around him. The issue was rather, to judge by the charges of his legate Peter Damian, that this public preaching and agitation were not appropriate tasks for monks. Accompanying this was a deep concern that these monks would preach wrong doctrine. The Vallombrosan monks involved held no ecclesiastical office that could justify their taking on a non-monastic role. Thus the question in the case of the Vallombrosans was not whether the papacy should or should not throw its weight behind the anti-simony struggle, but the much deeper theological tangle of whether

⁷⁵ Quilici, pp. 74–75.

⁷⁶ PL 146: 1406, #120, cited in Meade, p. 333.

monks have any right to be out of their monasteries at all, let alone cause widespread agitation and foment revolt against a consecrated bishop.

Papal letters had no effect, and so the pope sent Peter Damian to Florence, probably in 1066, to mediate between the bishop and the anti-simonists. He wrote his main statement against the Vallombrosans, letter 146, only after his conciliatory efforts had failed.⁷⁷ In this treatise, addressed to the people of Florence, Peter is clearly speaking about monks rather than hermits, but he uses the same arsenal of complaints against them as he had against the "city hermit" Teuzo. The issue at hand is that those who should be cut off from the world are purposely telling the laity what to do, here in the cause of Church reform. Again, in their ignorance, the monks do not understand the issues well enough to teach them to others, even if it were allowable. Peter introduces the treatise with the statement that some fellow monks are saying that simonists cannot consecrate chrism, dedicate churches, make clerics, or celebrate mass—in other words, are arguing that the ordination of simonists is invalid, leading back to the most disputed issue of the ecclesiastical reform.⁷⁸

The complaints against the Vallombrosans are basically the same as all Peter's statements against religious acting in the world. The monks are guilty of pride for thinking they have a right to interfere. Even the apostle Paul was content to appeal to the emperor—is the pope worse than Nero? Damian lashes out at Vallombrosan pretensions in his finest rhetorical style:

Do we believe that these monks are holier than Paul? Paul, who was found worthy to ascend before the tribunal of the third heaven, but did not disdain to appeal to the court of Nero? Who are these monks who, through the arrogance of their sanctity, think they can reject the judgment of the Apostolic See?⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Goetz, p. 233.

⁷⁸ It is interesting to note that in Migne's edition of Damian's works this treatise is entitled "Concerning the Sacraments when they are administered by unworthy persons." Damian makes it plain in the treatise that the Vallombrosans had taken a Donatist stand and had declared the sacraments of simoniacal priests invalid. See PL 145: 523–30.

⁷⁹ "Credimus monachos istos sanctiores esse quam Paulum? Cum ergo Paulus qui tertii caeli tribunal ante conscenderat, Neroniano conspectui non sit dedignatus adistere, quis est monachus qui pro suae sanctitatis arrogantia sedis apostolicae debeat iudicium reprobare . . ." Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #146, 3: 540.

Both here and at the synod that nearly condemned the Vallombrosans, Peter compared these troublemakers to locusts, destroying the Church in their misguided fervor.⁸⁰ The arguments of desperate need for separation from the world, pride, disobedience, and improper teaching mark the letter against the Vallombrosans just as they do Peter Damian's statements about evangelical hermits. However, it is questionable whether Peter would have been so vehement if the issue had not been that of ecclesiastical reform, and the fragile edifice of the definition of simony he was central in building.

John and his disciples—the evidence is clear that the rank and file of the monastery were also involved⁸¹—publicly called the bishop a simoniac and heretic. The city was openly divided over the issue.⁸² Matters came to a head in 1066 or 1067, when Bishop Peter sent his men to burn the Vallombrosan monastery of St. Salvi, thinking that John Gualbert was there at the time. The bishop's troops entered the church during nocturns, either butchering or beating all the monks they could lay hands on, and pillaged the monastery. According to the Vallombrosan reports, the people of Florence came to the devastated monastery the next day. They brought food and other necessities for the wounded and impoverished monks. They also collected relics of the blood that the monks had shed the night before.⁸³ Thus the fact of violence, especially in a church, immediately catapulted the Vallombrosan cause to the level of martyrdom for the faith, an enormous psychological advantage for the active monastic movement and for all forces fighting for clerical reform.

The supporters of Vallombrosa of course elevated the events at-

⁸⁰ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #146, 3: 542. Also in Anonymous, *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*, (5): 1106–7. See Goetz, p. 233 for a discussion of Peter Damian's speech at the synod of 1067 as presented in the *vita*, which he accepts as authentic. If this is true, the speech makes it very obvious that Hildebrand defended the monks against the arguments of both the pope and Peter Damian, praising them for their zeal for the faith, at least six years before he became pope. See Quilici, pp. 80–81 and all three *vitae* of John Gualbert.

⁸¹ A large number of Vallombrosans entered papal service. Peter Igneus was "just a monk," as was the Vallombrosan who tried to to displace the bishop of Lucca by a similar ordeal in 1085. If simony had been a concern only for John Gualbert himself, one would have expected *him* to go through an ordeal by fire, rather than leaving the task to one of his followers. Critical references always say "Vallombrosans" are causing the trouble, not John Gualbert. It is also ridiculous to think of John Gualbert as the only Vallombrosan who mattered—even Peter Damian the rhetorician could hardly describe a single person as a horde of locusts, ravaging the land.

⁸² Atto, (60): 691; Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (69): 1094.

⁸³ Andreas, *Vita Iohannes*, (72): 1095; Atto, (61): 692.

tendant upon the sack of St. Salvi into a statement of goals and ideals. According to them, the Vallombrosans were such ideal monks that they did not resist this murderous attack, nor did they even break the night silence prescribed by the Benedictine Rule.⁸⁴ While this claim stretches the bounds of credulity, it is an interesting reflection on the points the hagiographers wanted to make to their public. Odo of Cluny's followers had allowed the theft of their horses rather than break the night silence;⁸⁵ John Gualbert's people let themselves be killed. The hagiographer is emphasizing yet again: "We *are* Benedictines! See how serious we are in our profession! Even in emergencies we observe every stricture of the Rule!"

By not resisting, or at least by the later claim that they did not resist the bishop's attack, the Vallombrosans also made a place for themselves in the contemporary literature of martyrdom. Passive acceptance of their fate, as we have seen for missionaries, is a key element in the ideal of martyrdom in the early eleventh century. The hagiographers who wrote about the attack gloried in the martyrdom of their brethren and described the event in terms of the most unstinting enthusiasm. John Gualbert, who arrived on the scene the next morning, is depicted as mournful that some of his monks had suffered in his absence; he wished he could have been there to shed his blood with them. Andreas then argued that the attack on St. Salvi made the monks stronger, since they had tasted the crown of martyrdom.⁸⁶

In terms of their goal to teach the people of Florence, the monks of St. Salvi had won an important victory. One of the most serious charges that threatened active monks was that of instability of purpose. Their enemies accused them of being gyrovagues and sarabaites, wanderers who took up whatever cause they felt inclined to make a fuss about, unable to tolerate the salutary long-term discipline best typified by a monastic community. Martyrdom, in the religious terms of the day, was of course the ultimate proof of firmness of purpose, since the martyr stood firm even through death and, what is more,

⁸⁴ Atto, (60): 691; according to Andreas, the attack took place during nocturns. Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (71): 1095.

⁸⁵ John of Salerno, *The Life of Odo of Cluny*, in *St. Odo of Cluny*, ed. and trans. Gerard Sitwell (London, 1958), (II.10): 53. Tellenbach points out in "Zum Wesen der Cluniacenser" *Saeculum* 9 (1958): 372 that the sources for Cluny often stress the deep silence of Cluniac communities.

⁸⁶ Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (73): 1095.

a death in which he was not even allowed to defend himself. That a cause is important enough for someone to die for it must also give critics pause.

Although the details of the attack on St. Salvi may be largely the invention of hagiographers writing twenty or more years later, modeling the purpose of the monks on that occasion to fit with their own polemical and apologetic purposes, the theme of witness soon appeared again. Soon after the St. Salvi attack, in 1067, an embassy of Vallombrosan monks went to Rome and at a papal synod denounced Bishop Peter as a simoniac and heretic. They went on to offer a trial by fire: one of their monks would walk through fire to prove the truth of their accusations against their bishop.

Their appearance at the Roman synod brought the Vallombrosans yet again into conflict with ecclesiastical authority. The papal curia received them with disfavor. Pope Alexander II did not even want to hear their accusation, and refused to allow their proposed ordeal. Most of the assembled bishops (including many monastic members of the curia) also opposed them. Peter Damian, especially, spoke against them. In the anonymous *vita* of John Gualbert, Peter is said to have called the Vallombrosans locusts, who were eating up all the greenness of the Church.⁸⁷ As they had a few years earlier, the Vallombrosans aroused suspicion on two counts. They were monks who were preaching, and their stand was probably more radical than that of a majority of members of the papal court. Second, through their fight with Peter Mezzabarba they showed the independence of their actions and ideology, while by this time the pope was trying to gain direct control over the Church reform, as well as get all the credit for it. It is hard to tell which was the more serious offense. The main Vallombrosan spokesman at the synod, Abbot Rodulfus of Muscitano, argued that the Eucharist, when consecrated by an immoral priest, was not the body of Christ.⁸⁸ After a period of uncertainty, the ruling body of the Church in Rome was turning away from this extreme teaching, and thus was unlikely to view the Val-

⁸⁷ *Vita Iohannis Gualberti anonymo*, (5): 1106–1107. Goetz believes that Peter Damian's statement in this work really does stem from Peter Damian, which appears to fit in with Peter Damian's other comments on monk preachers in general and the Vallombrosans in particular. Goetz, p. 233.

⁸⁸ *Vita Iohannis Gualberti anonymo*, (5): 1107. This was in agreement with the views of Humbert of Silva Candida, who indeed had cordial relations with the Vallombrosans and had consecrated their first church. Quilici, 3: 68.

lombrosans with favor. The Vallombrosans indeed provide a good example of what an explosive issue this was. They encouraged the belief that all clergy were suspect, to be examined carefully instead of venerated as God's ministers. The Vallombrosan propagandists even claimed to hold the Eucharist in such veneration that they avoided celebrating it, lest perhaps a simonist or incontinent priest corrupt it.⁸⁹ And they refused to accept any authority but their own interpretations of scripture and their own consciences.

Peter Damian stands out in all the records as the Vallombrosans' main opponent at the synod. As he states in a later letter, it is presumptuous for a monk to speak against his diocesan at all. With his biting wit, Peter declares: "But, oh new presumption! We are subject to the opinions of the dead [monks were traditionally considered dead to the world] and they are made judges over bishops, over those under whom they were lawfully placed."⁹⁰

In other words, in at least some instances, this wandering rabble did not merely leave the stability of the claustral life; they did it in willful disobedience to superior authority. According to Peter, leading a holy life consisted in large part of giving up one's will to a lawful superior. He denounced the disobedient and willful spirit of some of these "pseudo-hermits," arguing that they were not truly holy men because they did not blindly follow a superior. The besetting sin Damian sees in Teuzo, as well as others of these interfering would-be reformers, is that of pride.⁹¹ Besides obedience and stability, the other absolutely vital requirement for a man to be a good and holy religious is humility. Eleventh-century texts refer to lack of humility among the professional religious. Bishops complained about the *ruinosa superbia*, the "ruinous pride" of monks,⁹² while Peter Damian inveighed against any men, monastic or eremitical or falling into the cracks between the two sorts, who were guilty of the sin of pride. Was this a complaint against fat, rich monks who exuded an air of smug superiority? Or was it bitterness that some religious assumed that they had a duty to tell the world what a mess it was in, especially in the case of simony? It is hard to imagine a bishop such as

⁸⁹ Atto, (23): 680.

⁹⁰ "Sed, o nova praesumptio! Mortuorum sententiis subiacemus et episcoporum sunt iudices facti, qui legaliter sub eorum fuerant legibus constituti." Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 224.

⁹¹ See e.g., Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #44, 2: 9.

⁹² Giovanni Tabacco, "Vescovi e monasteri," in *Il Monachesimo et la riforma*, p. 106.

Peter Mezzabarba of Florence praising the monks of Vallombrosa for their public attacks on his simony. As Damian reminds the reader, the role of a monk, or of any ascetic, is to weep over sins rather than to teach.⁹³ As he complains to the Vallombrosans, they think themselves so holy that they are arrogant enough even to set themselves up against the authority of the pope.⁹⁴

The most pernicious form this disobedience could take was for a monk or hermit to break ties with the discipline of a cloister and its abbot or prior, giving up the habit of obedience that is central to the religious life. It is plain that Peter knows cases in which hermits (or monks) have failed in obedience and abandoned their superiors to take up the life of a wandering or isolated holy man. Most common is the situation of a monk leaving his monastery as a protest against simony, the very foundation upon which John Gualbert built Vallombrosa.

Almost the only defender who stood forth on the side of the complaining monks was Hildebrand, the future Pope Gregory VII, who in a few months would become archdeacon of the Roman Church. Hildebrand, himself a monk, threw himself wholeheartedly into the fray, arguing that the Vallombrosans were totally justified in their actions and identifying himself with their cause. The author of the anonymous *vita* of John Gualbert tells how the Vallombrosans at the synod were like lambs among wolves until Hildebrand, "the monk and archdeacon," stood up to defend them. This encounter in Rome provides an extraordinary preview of the battle that would be joined in the next pontificate, that of Hildebrand himself. The hagiographer suggests that Hildebrand already used an argument that became important in the early debates of the Investiture Contest: Christ is the Truth (1 Jn 5.6), and all actions should be based on that theological fact. Therefore defending the truth is the same as witnessing for Christ.⁹⁵ Hildebrand clearly thought that such witness was more important than were monastic quiet and stability, since he defended the Vallombrosans. The hagiographer was very careful to point out

⁹³ Leclercq, *Saint Pierre Damien*, p. 140. See Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 223 for a very clear statement of this. I cannot agree with Ferretti, who argues that Peter Damian perceived the proper monastic life as a balance between the active and contemplative lives, except in the most limited sense of physical activity interspersed with periods of contemplation. See Ferretti, 1: 247.

⁹⁴ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #146, 3: 540.

⁹⁵ *Vita Iohannis Gualberti anonymo*, (5): 1107.

that this admired figure was himself a monk. Of course this was after Hildebrand, as Pope Gregory VII, had raised the fight against simony to a new level. Other sources usually describe Hildebrand simply as "archdeacon," but it was important for the Vallombrosan hagiographer to identify Hildebrand as a fellow monk, a sharer in the same ideals of worldly activity for a worthy cause.⁹⁶

This account of the Roman synod of 1067 provides another firm reminder of the element of personal conviction behind the actions of monks who engaged in the work of reform at both administrative and lower levels. Hildebrand, like the monks he was defending, is described as feeling a moral obligation to speak out on what he believed to be right. Thanks to Hildebrand's support, the incident ended with the failure of the council to reach any decision on the case.⁹⁷

Alexander II had forbidden the Vallombrosans to conduct their trial by fire, but they did so anyway, on 13 February 1068. A monk named Peter, afterwards surnamed "Igneus" to commemorate the ordeal, was selected to go through fire to prove the bishop's simony. He did so without harm, according to an exultant letter written to the pope on the following day, as the monks gloated over this signal proof of their rectitude.⁹⁸ This turn of events left the pope no choice. The people of Florence, after seeing the monk Peter's feat, rose against their bishop, who had to flee the city. Peter Mezzabarba was then deposed at the Roman Easter synod.⁹⁹ But Alexander II does not appear to have been swayed only by popular pressure; he made the monk Peter a cardinal, probably in autumn of that same year, which strongly suggests that he was moved and impressed by the demonstration.¹⁰⁰

The Vallombrosan gamble won, and it was left to later historians

⁹⁶ On papal privileges to Vallombrosa, see Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo*, p. 48.

⁹⁷ Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (73): 1095; Atto, (62): 692; *Vita Iohannis Gualberti anonymo*, (5): 1107; see also Quilici, 3: 81.

⁹⁸ The text of the letter is given in Atto, (64): 693–8; see also Andreas, *Vita Iohannes*, (75): 1096–1099. The whole incident is analyzed in Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo*, see especially pp. 23–42.

⁹⁹ Andreas, *Vita Iohannes*, (75): 1099.

¹⁰⁰ Miccoli, *Pietro Igneo*, p. 47. Other authors were impressed by the trial by fire. Bonizo mentions the ordeal when he refers to Peter's later death, (VIII): 612; as does Bernoldus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1089], p. 449. Meade, p. 325 dates Peter's creation as cardinal-bishop of Albano to 1074, in the pontificate of Gregory VII, although on weak evidence. Peter was active as a papal legate until his death in 1089. See Goetz, p. 235.

to make their methods more palatable. As we have seen, John Gualbert's hagiographers had a threefold approach, about which we know since the sources are still extant and we can better observe what is idiosyncratic and what was most likely common to all Vallombrosans. All three were very careful to refute possible criticisms. Their defense fell under the categories of observance of the Benedictine Rule, the exceptional nature of the cause for which the Vallombrosans fought, and the theological precepts that applied to all humans, without a division of the world into monk and non-monk. All of the hagiographers stressed that the Vallombrosans were truly Benedictine monks, despite what anyone else might say. Certainly the warmth of such statements strongly suggests that at least some critics did make such accusations. They emphasized the stability clauses of the Rule, since any violation of that was an issue at which their enemies could point. The Vallombrosan stand on this point was that the Rule should be taken out of the context of tradition and examined without what they perceived as the patina of superfluous and sometimes outmoded tradition. They wanted to show that, although the Vallombrosans did not look stable, the observation was based on faulty observation, not fact. Moreover, these monks were depicted as fighting for a single cause of monumental proportions, rather than wasting their monastic quiet on a variety of goals in the world. These writers ignored any other activities the Vallombrosans may have pursued in the world for the sake of presenting simony as *the* problem of the age. It is unlikely that a spiritual advisor with the reputation of John Gualbert would have limited his counsels to a single issue in this way, or that his followers would have been so occupied castigating the secular clergy that they had nothing to say about the morals of the laity, but we find very little but simony in these *vitae*. Thus, Vallombrosans appear to act in the world as a specific exception to their normal monastic ideology of withdrawal.

There are in fact signs of other roles in secular society that John and his followers took upon themselves. They were important in the organization of lay fraternities to further lay morality and good religious conduct, without expecting their lay followers to quit the world and enter a monastery.¹⁰¹ They founded guest houses for travelers,

¹⁰¹ Ferretti, pp. 233-77 for the Vallombrosan view of the laity; Goetz, p. 236 for the organization of lay fraternities.

mostly pilgrims, and John Gualbert also gave an important impetus to the growth of the order of canons regular.¹⁰² Such activities suggest interest, to say the least, in secular society and its religious needs. They also suggest a level of ambivalence about how active monks should be in such tasks. Lay fraternities suggest direct ministry to the laity, while guest houses hint at a more limited and typically Benedictine interaction of a few members of the community with their lay guests. At least, there is no indication in the Vallombrosan sources that members of the community felt themselves at risk of pollution from contact with secular people—the pollutants were the simonist secular clergy, not the laypeople who were the Vallombrosans' most zealous supporters. On the other hand, John's encouragement of canons regular suggests that he accepted the view of his time that pastoral ministry was not a proper role for Benedictine monks, even though he clearly perceived the need for such a ministry. Thus he appears to have encouraged the flow of monks or potential monks driven by a desire to serve in the world into a channel that would contain many elements of Benedictine life, but, as a non-monastic organization, would not totally upset the accepted ideals of what constitutes sound Benedictine principle.

The final defense, that the monks of Vallombrosa were following their conscience in the face of all opposition, is the only really radical defense. It is this apologia that broke down received categories of thought in the eleventh century. Non-Vallombrosan historians in sympathy with the anti-simony movement were clearly troubled by the events of 1067, and watered down their reports to make the Vallombrosans appear less willful and independent. Bertholdus, one of the leading historians of the Investiture Contest, tells in his chronicle how the Vallombrosans turned the clergy and people of Florence against Peter Mezzabarba. He agrees with the Vallombrosan hagiographers that they created great dissension both in Tuscany and in surrounding areas. Yet in his account, the papacy plays a much greater role, and the monks are reduced almost to the level of a papal tool. Pope Alexander took the initiative, according to Bertholdus, in summoning both the bishop and the monks to Rome, to decide in synod whether the monks' complaints were justified. Bertholdus tells how

¹⁰² Andreas, *Vita Iohannes*, (29): 1087; for John's work to further the canons regular, see Sofia Boesch, "Giovanni Gualberto e la vita comune del clero nelle biografie di Andrea da Strumi e di Atto da Vallombrosa," in *La vita comune del clero*, 2: 228.

the assembled bishops agreed that there should be a trial by fire since there was otherwise insufficient evidence to decide. The ordeal was then held in Florence, with full papal consent.¹⁰³ Bertholdus was plainly uncomfortable with the notion that the Vallombrosans were acting independently, especially in the face not of papal support but of criticism. Bertholdus' skewed account is also a good demonstration of the papal supremacy he supports throughout his chronicles, moving effective papal control back to a time before it could really have been possible.

It was impossible to ignore a group like the Vallombrosans, as independent agitators could be ignored. John and his followers were called in to help simony fighters in other areas of Italy, best known in the summons of the people of Milan to provide non-simoniactal clergy. They were in basic rapport with the Pataria, the predominantly lay group of radicals agitating for reform in Milan. John Gualbert gave active support to the movement. Some Milanese came to him asking for help and telling how many of the people of Milan were going without either penance or communion, since they were afraid of dealing with their own simoniac clergy. John responded by having several men, including some of his own novices, ordained by a sympathetic bishop, and sending them to Milan.¹⁰⁴ The ties with Milan became especially close after the death of Arialdus, the leader of the Pataria. There was a flow of his supporters to Vallombrosa, including the hagiographer Andreas of Strumi.¹⁰⁵ It is unlikely that such zealous anti-simonists would have joined the community of Vallombrosa solely for their rigorous observance of the Benedictine Rule.

Bishop Hermannus of Volterra also applied to John Gualbert to lend some of his monks for pastoral help in his diocese. Here, John wrote a long letter demanding that the diocese be set in as good order as possible—no simoniacs and no married clergy should be allowed. If this were done, he promised, “we will come to you, if it should be expedient, and we shall do whatever is necessary for you,

¹⁰³ Bertholdus [a. 1067], p. 273.

¹⁰⁴ Andreas, *Vita Iohannes*, (78): 1100; Atto, (66): 698–99. See also Andreas Strumensi, *Vita s. Arialdi*, MGH SS 30,2: 1047–75 for events in Milan from a Vallombrosan/Patarian viewpoint. In the end, in c. 1070 Bishop Rudolfus, a papal legate from the Vallombrosan circle, was invited to Milan to exercise episcopal functions. Cinzio Violante, *La pataria milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica* (Rome, 1955), 1: 149. Peter Damian firmly forbade going to a stranger priest to avoid a simonist. *Briefe*, #40, 1: 384–509.

¹⁰⁵ See Gajano, p. 108.

and legal and possible for us.”¹⁰⁶ One wonders what the limits were to Vallombrosan “legality.” It is likely that the help given to Volterra was the same as that supplied to Milan; the Vallombrosans would provide a purified clergy for people unwilling to deal with the impure.

Peter Damian and probably some other members of the curia wanted matters to flow in a smooth and hierarchically correct order. Despite what he says about the general irredeemability of the world, he urges his audience to consider that now imperial edicts, papal decrees, and synods are working to correct the wrongs of the Church. A monk should ask himself what he has to do with the kings of the earth and synods. It should suffice for him to weep for his own sins.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, who is going to do the work of reform, if the bishops are simonists and monks and hermits are disbarred from service? Peter the theorist never answers that question.

vi. *Servants of the papacy?*

When the Investiture Contest broke out in 1076, the Vallombrosans were firm supporters of the papacy as long as their goals ran side by side. They remained in close agreement with their former protector Gregory VII, who praised them for their true love of the Church.¹⁰⁸ Gregory drew a number of Vallombrosans into the papal hierarchy, which, since it drew them effectively out of the rank and file of monks in the world acting on their own authority, cannot concern us here. But Vallombrosan monks, still part of their communities and without any ecclesiastical office, continued the same course upon which they had already set. The Vallombrosan specialty was direct conflict with bishops, as we can see during the Investiture Contest itself.

In c. 1084 a Vallombrosan monk preached against another Bishop Peter, this time the simoniac anti-bishop of Lucca, who had been placed there by Henry IV. The monk spoke publicly, despite his avowal that he was a simple man, without education. Following the example of Peter Igneus, he also challenged the bishop or his supporters to a trial by fire. The monk, operating in a much more highly

¹⁰⁶ “ad vos veniemus, si expedierit, et, quicquid vobis necessarium et nobis licitum et possibile fuerit, faciemus.” Letter included in Andreas, *Vita Iohannis*, (67): 1093–94.

¹⁰⁷ Petrus Damiani, *Briefe*, #165, 4: 223.

¹⁰⁸ Goetz, p. 239.

charged political environment, was soon violently expelled from the city. The proud avowal of the monk that he was unlearned has very interesting parallels to the Waldensian movement in the next century. He based his claim to superiority purely on moral and spiritual rectitude, rather than on a course of training that would have made him an appropriate preacher to the people of Lucca. The account also shows a similar motivation to that of John Gualbert and his earlier disciples; this was a case of imitation of Christ to the point of martyrdom, even if the other side would not carry out their part. The author of the nearly contemporary account implies that the monk felt he would only truly be a monk if he were a martyr.¹⁰⁹

In the time of their worldly activity, the monks of Vallombrosa were clearly stretching the limits of how the Benedictine Rule was understood. They followed the Benedictine Rule, but their religiosity was molded by more than that venerated text, or the Carolingian interpretation that was so well established that it had almost the sanctity of the Rule itself. Even without the witness of John Gualbert's anonymous hagiographer, it would be plain that their community owed much to the rules of St. Basil, with its emphasis on practical help both to brethren and outsiders.¹¹⁰ Monks were obligated to help one another and to help people outside of the monastery walls. Love of neighbor was thus broadly and actively conceived, and was an obligation superior to obeying the Benedictine Rule.

The Vallombrosan attitude can be summed up by a little incident related in passing in the last *vita* of Abbot John. The story goes that once, when John was visiting the Vallombrosan daughter house of Muscitano, he gave medicine to the monks there. Abbot Rodulfus reproached him for doing so; he had no right to interfere without permission in the running of another house. John Gualbert responded that he would never go back to that monastery again, since he was reproached there for trying to imitate the goodness of God by showing mercy and doing good. Rodulfus repented and begged his friend's

¹⁰⁹ Rangerius, *Vita metrica s. Anselmi Lucensis episcopi*, MGH SS 30,2, (ll. 5153–5176): 1264; see also Gajano, p. 117.

¹¹⁰ *Vita Iohannis Gualberti anonymo*, (3): 1106. See Basil, *The Long Rules*, in *Ascetical Works*, trans. M. Monica Wagner (Washington, D.C., 1962), who points out that at the Last Judgment those without good works will be damned (preface): 224. A central part of Basil's Rule is the necessity of living in a group, since no individual is self-sufficient. (Q7): 248–52. He is also remarkably liberal in his commands regarding speech, including both laymen and women. (Q33): 297.

pardon.¹¹¹ It is not surprising that, as mentioned above, John in his final letter to his disciples emphasized the duty of Christians to love one another.¹¹² This would be normal Benedictine piety, if it were not so plain from John's life that he included the laity and secular clergy in this love, and in a very active and practical sense. To him and his followers, it seems plain that this precept took priority over all rules, laws, and risks of contact with the world.

¹¹¹ Ibid., (7): 1108.

¹¹² Andreas, *Vita Iohannes*, (80): 1101.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ANTI-GREGORIAN PROPAGANDA AND THE MONASTIC CRISIS

When the Investiture Contest broke into a state of open war between Pope Gregory VII and King Henry IV in 1076, one of the side effects was that criticism of monks involved in ecclesiastical reform reached a greater level of intensity. No longer was it simply a matter of distaste that Benedictines should preach or attempt to sway a lay audience, nor was it even an issue of outraged propriety—monks interested in Church reform were involved in a controversy with enormous stakes. Most of the active monks threw in their lot with the papal camp. After all, the papal reform had adopted the monks' own causes of anti-simony and anti-nicolaitism, although other issues were also involved in the papal reform program. As we have seen for Vallombrosa, such issues as papal supremacy did not have such immediate appeal, and not all monks engaged in ecclesiastical reform accepted them. This involvement on the papal side of the Investiture Conflict included monks of both levels discussed in the last chapter—the intelligentsia who served the curia and gave tongue to theories of proper doctrine, and the usually anonymous monks, like those of Vallombrosa, spreading a simplified teaching among the laity.

One of these monks trying to stretch the mores of Benedictinism to include action in the world was the pope, Gregory VII. In the controversy that surrounded Gregory, all the arguments for and against monks playing an active role in the world were thrashed out in the first public propaganda campaign of the middle ages. The monks who aided Gregory as a community and therefore had a clear identity, the members of the German house of Hirsau, were also victims of propagandistic pens. It was quickly clear to pro-imperial writers that the monastic ways of Gregory and his supporters, who did not adhere to the traditional Benedictine life as they understood it, were a handy stick with which to beat their papal opponents. On the papal side, polemicists were loud in their defense of both Gregory's actions and those of his monastic supporters. The unfolding of this polemic completed the process of dividing the Benedictine world

down the middle. It is in these highly charged political treatises that the lines of conflict become particularly clear between a traditional notion of Benedictine monasticism and a broader, more world-accepting definition, that subsumed the monk into the larger category of the whole community of Christians. And it is to this conflict that we should look to understand the final steps of how Benedictine monasticism came to have a narrow definition that forced the development of new religious groups in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.

i. *Hirsau as model for world-reforming monasticism*

This process of definition and distinction in the polemics of the eleventh century stands out in the pro-papal involvement of the monks of Hirsau. As usual, we are better informed about the arguments against them, in this case made by pro-imperial polemicists, than about those of the Hirsauer themselves. The critique of Hirsau forms part of the polemical writings concerning the Investiture Contest. This propagandistic attack on Hirsau, I believe, applies more widely than just to the German monastery of Hirsau and its daughter houses. It reveals the presence of monks who believed their actions in the world were necessary for the salvation of Christendom. Polemics against Hirsau also expose how the debate over activity by monks in the world had clarified over the century of this study. Finally, the history and historiography of Hirsau both display the ongoing strength of traditional Benedictine ideals. In this case, the Hirsauer chose to remain within the Benedictine fold and disavow most of their actions in the world, rather than to break off and form a new congregation, one that accepted a new role in the world even at the price of much of the Benedictine past. Still, Hirsau's struggle with tradition is, I believe, exemplary of the situation in other monasteries whose course is not so well-documented. Thus, I wish to examine Hirsau as a model cloister poised between the world and the traditions of withdrawal.

The involvement of whole monasteries in reform preaching and agitation is not well-attested in the eleventh century. We simply do not know how many monasteries might have been involved. Still, to have clear evidence that two whole monasteries took to action in the world for the cause of Church reform, Hirsau in Germany and Vallombrosa in Italy, is surprising. One should probably consider

our information about these two congregations as the tip of an iceberg. There are some fragmented mentions of monastic involvement in Gregory VII's cause in southern Germany, including monks who preached against Henry IV and his followers, and who gave both material and moral aid to the papally-supported anti-king. The available sources speak of three closely related monasteries that stood in the forefront of the Investiture Controversy: Hirsau and its daughter houses of St. Blasien and St. George in the Black Forest, along with other houses that remained juridically tied to them.¹ While Hirsau adopted the customs of Cluny, under the leadership of Abbot William the monastery as a whole adopted a far more radically active stand toward the world than did the conservative Cluny.² Schieffer points out that Hirsau's decision to join the conflict against Henry IV cannot be taken to include all the new monastic movements of the century. Hirsau's involvement in the papal cause also cannot be used to implicate the Cluniac confederation in papal reform at the popular level, although Hirsau adopted the customs for daily conduct of life from the Cluniacs.

Abbot William of Hirsau became firmly dedicated to the papal cause, and his monastery began to take action early in the controversy, but it is not clear when either occurred. Some date the beginnings of Hirsau involvement to the period in 1077 and 1078 when the papal legate Abbot Bernhardus of Marseilles was a refugee at

¹ St. George's was founded from Hirsau in 1083 and Theoger, its first abbot, was a disciple of William of Hirsau, but he was not consecrated abbot until he had been released from his obedience to William. Hans-Josef Wollasch, *Die Anfänge des Klosters St. Georgen im Schwarzwald* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1964), p. 102. After the death of William in 1091, St. George's became the leader of the reform in southern Germany. See Romuald Bauerreiß, "St. Georgen im Schwarzwald, ein Reformmittelpunkt Südostdeutschlands im beginnenden 12. Jahrhundert" *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 51 (1933): 196–98. St. Blasien was a cell of the imperial monastery of Rheinau, from which it became independent by 1065. See Franz Quarthal, ed., *Die Benediktinerklöster in Baden-Württemberg* (Augsburg, 1975), pp. 146–49 for a brief history. Hirsau, in the diocese of Speyer, was refounded in c. 1065 by the count of Calw, and placed under the authority of the papacy. The monastery soon adopted the customs of Cluny. Quarthal, pp. 283–84; Heinrich Büttner, "Abt Wilhelm von Hirsau und die Entwicklung der Rechtsstellung der Reformklöster im 11. Jahrhundert" *ZS für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 25 (1966): 321–38, especially pp. 321–22 for the early history of the monastery. For Hirsau's charter and its reliance on the Cluniac notion of *libertas*, see Hans Hirsch, "The Constitutional History of the Reformed Monasteries during the Investiture Contest," in *Mediaeval Germany 911–1250*, ed. Geoffrey Barraclough (Oxford, 1938), p. 134.

² Theodor Schieffer, "Cluny et la querelle des Investitures" *RH* 225 (1961): 67.

Hirsau.³ Jakobs, however, argues that Hirsauer preaching began in 1075. His argument is based on an entry in the *Annales Augustani* for the year 1075. The annalist relates in a very unsympathetic fashion that some monks from an unnamed place were leaving their cloisters and preaching ecclesiastical reform, as a result of Gregory VII's opening blows in his battle for clerical celibacy.⁴ This attitude that, if monks were preaching, it could only be Hirsauer, does not allow for other individuals or even possibly communities that may have been involved, and closer to Augsburg, where the chronicler lived. Besides, placing Hirsauer activity so early does not fit in well with other studies and records of the monastery. Giseke has argued that William was converted to the reforming party in 1075, when he visited Rome and remained there five months because of illness.⁵ With an abbot absent for probably at least seven months of the year 1075 (allowing for travel time), it is difficult to see how the Hirsauer could have organized the systematic rabble-rousing suggested by the *Annales Augustani*. Thus, it is very possible that the Augsburg Annals reveal the existence of other pro-papal monks besides the Hirsauer. Again, especially with our fragmentary records and the unwillingness of later generations to admit to action in the papal cause, we have no more than a hint that the phenomenon extended in scope beyond the Hirsau monks.

Certainly by 1077 Hirsau was firmly committed to the Gregorian party. Gregory VII clearly did not have the same qualms as his predecessor Alexander II about using monks for the work of reform, and welcomed these new troops in his spiritual army. All existing evidence supports the notion that not only did Gregory welcome monks as workers on the popular level of reform as well as in the curia, but that he also tried to force monks to take an active stand in his support. Indeed, as stated above, he appears to have quarreled with Abbot Hugh of Cluny because the monks of Cluny were not active enough supporters of the papal reform movement and war

³ Hans Feierabend, *Die politische Stellung der deutschen Reichsabteien während des Investiturstreites* (Breslau, 1913 (reprint ed. Aalen, 1971)), p. 23. See also Paul Giseke, *Die Hirschauer während des Investiturstreites* (Gotha, 1883), pp. 18, 24.

⁴ See Hermann Jakobs, *Die Hirsauer. Ihre Ausbreitung und Rechtsstellung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites* (Cologne/Graz, 1961), p. 205; *Annales Augustani*, MGH SS 3 [a. 1075], p. 128.

⁵ See Giseke, p. 18.

with the emperor. No evidence exists that Gregory held the Hirsauer in anything but the highest esteem for their activities.

For the Hirsauer were indeed active. Hirsau was a center for the enemies of Henry IV. For example, in 1077 the anti-king Rudolf celebrated Pentecost there. Hirsau was such a troublesome spot for Henry that he ordered its destruction in 1077, a fate it avoided only because of the sudden death of Bishop Wernerus of Strassburg, who led the attacking army.⁶ Many clerics and laymen became monks at Hirsau; the author of the *Historia Hirsaugiensis* says that they were drawn there because of the wars, and came to the monastery "as to an asylum."⁷ But these men do not appear to have entered Hirsau solely for refuge, especially since many less controversial monasteries were safer; some must have been among the monks of Hirsau who, according to their opponents, wandered about preaching publicly in support of Gregory VII and against simoniac clergy.

The Hirsauer appear to have broken several rules both of Benedictine observance and of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. They crossed over diocesan lines, invading the territory of bishops without permission. The *Constitutions of Hirsau*, adapted from Cluniac customs by William of Hirsau, specifically give permission for traveling monks to eat on the road without hearing mass, even on greater feast days, because they ought to hear mass only in known places or from known priests.⁸ This fits with the Gregorian prohibition from attending the masses of simoniac priests as a matter of obedience. However, the Hirsau monks seem also to have spread the belief, as did the Vallombrosans, that sacraments administered by an unworthy priest were not valid.⁹ If that were in fact the situation, such activity would have made them much more radical and dangerous to the hierarchy of the Church. Gregory VII appeared willing to accept help without looking too closely at the credentials of his helpers. There was no one after the death of Peter Damian to point out the weakness, both

⁶ Haimo, *Vita Willihelmi abbatis Hirsaugiensis*, MGH SS 12, (22): 222; Heinrich Büttner, "Die Bischofsstädte von Basel bis Mainz in der Zeit des Investiturstreites," in *Investiturstreit und Reichsverfassung*, ed. Josef Fleckenstein (Sigmaringen, 1973), p. 352.

⁷ "velut ad quoddam asilum." *Historia Hirsaugiensis monasterii*, MGH SS 14, (3): 256; Albert Brackmann, "Gregor VII und die kirchliche Reformbewegung in Deutschland" *StGreg* 2 (1947): 13.

⁸ Wilhelmus Hirsaugiensis, *Constitutiones Hirsaugiensis*, PL 150, (II.18): 1062.

⁹ *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*, MGH LL 2, (II.41): 272; Bernoldus, *Chronicon*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1091], p. 451; see Rotraut Schnitzer, *Die Vita B. Herlucae Pauls von Bernried* (Bamberg, 1967), p. 103.

theological and societal, that could result from a doctrine that the sacraments lost their validity when given by a simoniacal or married priest. Again keeping for themselves an independence of action similar to that of the Vallombrosans, the Hirsau monks themselves persistently refused to hear mass from anyone they even suspected of simony or unchastity.

The members of these pro-Gregorian houses were active in preaching not only on the specific issues of the Investiture Contest, but for the more general cause of moral reform. Thus they fit very well into the pattern of wandering monks and hermits from the early eleventh century. William of Hirsau was active as a spiritual advisor, as was his disciple Theoger, and the hagiographers of both are interested enough in this side of their lives to give it considerable coverage.¹⁰ Haimo, William's hagiographer, is insistent on William's care for everyone, not just for monks. He even lists the many sorts of people William taught. When describing the abbot's reforms of a particular German monastery, he proclaims that William did not just improve the monastery, but taught all grades and orders of the Church, including monks, bishops, priests, clerics, laymen; virgins, widows, and other women; paupers, and pilgrims. William instructed them all with both words and works. Haimo tells proudly: "One at a time the faithful of Christ fled to him as to a mother's lap, and many became more proficient in the ways of God through him."¹¹ Reports from c. 1090 tell that whole villages took up a semi-monastic lifestyle, encouraged by Hirsau preachers, in addition to the large numbers of individuals who took monastic vows under the influence of monastic reform centers. Pope Urban II (1088–1099) praised these new communes, and took them under his protection in 1091.¹² Theoger of St. George's

¹⁰ Theoger, while still a canon in Mainz, went to William of Hirsau for advice on some business; he was so filled with compunction on hearing William that he became a monk. *Vita Thegeri abbatis s. Georgii et episcopi Mettensis*, MGH SS 12, (1–7): 451. Both William and Theoger advised the holy woman Herluca. Paulus Bernriedensi, *Vita b. Herlucae*, AASS Apr. II, (11): 550. There are several other cases in both men's lives of their instruction of non-monks. For instance, William expounded the faith to a woman pauper. Haimo, (17): 217.

¹¹ "Singuli fideles Christi ad illum quasi ad sinum matris confugiebant, multumque per eum in Deo proficiebant." Haimo, (21): 218.

¹² Bernoldus [a. 1091], pp. 452–453. Many laymen were also attached as lay brothers to monasteries. Urban II praised the Swabian reform circle for this activity and took the new institution under his protection, also in 1091. See Kassius Hallinger, "Woher kommen die Laienbrüder?" *Analecta sacri ordinis Cisterciensis* 12 (1956): 85.

also organized groups of women into communal life, giving a rare glimpse of female involvement in these issues.¹³

Such concern for care of others outside the cloister suggests that the Hirsau monks were interested not just in papal reform; indeed that papal goals may have coincided at least in part accidentally with the monastery's independent goals and beliefs. Much of the evidence about Hirsau suggests that the Hirsauer were just continuing the shift within monasticism we have been examining. This of course is the more general trend in monastic ideology that was slowly spreading into Germany and Italy, with greater emphasis on working actively for the salvation of society rather than adhering exclusively to a prayer function. This is borne out by the extension of this concern for Christian morals to the realm of public preaching. Thus, for example, Abbot Theoderic of St. Hubert's in the Ardennes was a noted preacher, despite his abhorrence of public esteem and praise. The pattern is familiar by now. Theoderic, like most of his contemporaries, appears to have recognized the world as a dangerous place. His hagiographer tells how Theoderic feared the praise of men as he would the stealthy approach of a serpent, and knew that vainglory is a cause of ruin to angels and men alike.¹⁴ It is interesting, though, that even this statement shows a change in monastic thinking. The author does not show the world itself as polluting or despicable. Instead, the issue is stability of purpose, not physical avoidance. Theoderic fears that he will be tempted to forget monastic humility. Nevertheless, worries about the evil influence of worldly things did not keep the abbot away from action in the world. He frequently had to travel, especially in support of the Gregorian cause that he supported. When he did so, he acknowledged his own spiritual prowess as a tool to aid others. The author of his *vita* tells how in 1077, on his way back from Rome, Theoderic visited Rheims. It was a very hard winter and the people feared a great famine, so they came to Theoderic asking for his prayers to turn away God's anger from them. Thus far, the situation is not unusual. It was persistent demands on people of known holiness that turned them, reluctantly or not, to service in the world in the first place. But Theoderic did more than just pray, the proper course for a Benedictine in this position. He also made a public drive to improve the morals of the region. He

¹³ Feierabend, p. 30.

¹⁴ *Vita Theoderici*, MGH SS 12, (27): 53.

convinced the whole city to fast and gave a public sermon that turned them all to true repentance. The weather then changed and the famine was averted.¹⁵

Again, the office of preaching and teaching was becoming less an exclusive club for abbots and more an activity that involved much of the community, as we have come to expect of the spontaneous movement of monks toward roles in the world. The sources talk of the monks of Hirsau in the plural, not just of their abbots. One chronicler reports that the Hirsauer were so respected that they could safely pass through enemy lines.¹⁶ This of course confirms not just that multiple monks were involved, but that they were the recognized enemies of Henry IV.

ii. *The polemic against Hirsau*

To members of the imperial party, the monks of Hirsau were gyro-vagues or *circumcelliones*, the derogatory term Augustine had used of Donatists who wandered about disrupting catholic life. Like contemporary *circumcelliones*, the Hirsauer wandered about preaching in support of Gregory and against simoniac clergy, an action completely inappropriate to the monastic state. They were also schismatics, sowing discord throughout the land. The fullest critique of the preaching monks involved in the papal cause, directed specifically against the community of Hirsau, is found in the *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*, probably written by Bishop Walrumus of Naumburg in c. 1090.¹⁷ This author's comments provide much valuable information on what it was that the monks of Hirsau were doing, and, even more importantly for this study, how they came into conflict with traditional views of the monastic life. For comparison, we are fortunate enough to have a second major source on the preaching of the Hirsau monks, the *Carmen Laureshamense*, written by a monk of Lorsch sometime after 1106. This is an appeal to Henry V to expel the encroaching Hirsauer from Lorsch itself, since of course the process of monastic reform did not stop during the period of the larger Church reform

¹⁵ Ibid., (26): 52.

¹⁶ Giseke, p. 83, citing *Vita Theogeni*, MGH SS 12, (I.29): 463.

¹⁷ *Liber de unitate*, (introduction): 177–182. It has also frequently been suggested that the author of the tract was a monk of Hersfeld.

movement. William of Hirsau had been given charge of Lorsch to reform.¹⁸ The poet is at pains to show that the Hirsauer are not capable of governing any other monastery, because they are barely monks themselves. Both authors attack the Hirsauer by calling them the most reprehensible things they can think of. In both cases, the attack focuses on the role of the monks as wandering preachers.

Complaints against the monks of Hirsau concentrate on three charges: they are schismatics (a characteristic they would share with any other member of the Gregorian party), they lack proper monastic humility, and they are traitors to the Benedictine Rule precisely because of their propensity for wandering. It is not surprising, in an imperialist tract, to find that the Hirsauer are “imitators or authors of schism.” According to the polemicist, they and their “school,” apparently monasteries that had adopted the customs of Hirsau, were sending out letters against both the apostolic see (the anti-pope Clement) and royal power. They were working for public evil rather than its welfare. What is more, their schism was a division within monasticism, which had always been one (the author had apparently never read the complaints of Poppo’s reform in the *Casus s. Galli*).¹⁹ Again, we are left to speculate on how the Hirsauer caused a rift within the monastic *ordo*. The statement does suggest that the Hirsauer were attracting other monks to their cause. Perhaps their agitation was having some effect on other monasteries in Germany, or at least on individual monks, turning them toward the papal party.

This statement that monastic reformers in general as well as those who included a program of ecclesiastical reform were ripping apart the seamless web of monasticism is a criticism that our active monks had faced since early in the century. Now, on a larger scale, it is the unity of the entire Church that is at stake. The issue of “proper” monasticism evoked both radical and conservative analyses, as did the more general issue of papal power. These treatises certainly provide evidence that there was widespread arguing and even fighting among the monasteries of the Empire. But does it mean more? When monks transferred to another house for programmatic reasons—those monks, e.g., the Hirsauer, who had a clearly defined attitude toward

¹⁸ For background, see *Carmen Laureshamense*, in *Codex Laureshamensis*, vol. 1, ed. Karl Glöckner (Darmstadt, 1929), (introduction): 418–19; *Chronicon Laureshamense*, MGH SS 21, p. 421.

¹⁹ *Liber de unitate*, (II.3): 266.

the world, the papacy, and secular authority—they were proclaiming that different monasteries worked for different goals. This put pressure on monasteries to define themselves, and many monasteries, like Vallombrosa, were founded with a clear framework of action already established. As the twelfth century got underway, other monasteries, “new congregations,” were founded with their own perspective toward the world. When this occurred, we can indeed say that the Benedictine monopoly has been broken.

Public preaching, especially against one's own abbot, is closely related to the issue of monastic humility. We have already seen several times the strong feeling that monks should not set themselves up as authorities, especially against the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The author of the *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*²⁰ says that monks should be humble—a quality notably lacking in the monks of Hirsau. He complains that these monks care more about their established way of life than about the gospels or the commands of God. More specifically, he accuses them of going against the good and spiritual way taught by the Benedictine Rule,²¹ a complaint that had not changed since the charges against Richard of St. Vanne and Poppo of Lorsch in the 1030's. Certainly on this occasion, when monks are accused of arrogance, it is not an issue whether they have become wealthy or not. It is their claim to know better than the spokesmen of the Catholic Church (in this treatise, that of course means the imperial side in the Investiture dispute) that exposes them to charges of pride, disobedience, and arrogance. Peter Damian had already leveled all these accusations against the Vallombrosans. Both communities had set themselves up as apostates from the unity of the Church. In a telling passage, the anonymous author of the *Liber* tells how the Hirsauer “have placed their seat above the height of the clouds,” since they refuse to accept divinely sanctioned authority, likening their position to Satan's pride before his fall (Is 14.14).²²

The author of the *Liber* is not alone in asserting that humility is central to the spirit of Benedictine monasticism and that the Hirsauer were doing very poorly at it. He follows a long tradition in his complaint that the Hirsauer have set themselves up as modern Pharisees,

²⁰ For a recent bibliography on the polemicists on both sides of the Investiture struggle, see Ian S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (New York, 1978).

²¹ *Liber de unitate*, (II.41): 271–72.

²² “et supra altitudinem nubium sedem suam posuerunt.” Ibid., (II.43): 280.

pretending that they know the truth and asserting it loudly and obnoxiously in public places.²³ The terms the author uses are reminiscent of Peter Damian's critique of the "city hermit" Teuzo. What their opponents confronted was the disagreeable certainty expressed by these monks that they were in a special position to recognize "truth." Certainly it was based on a sense of moral superiority, bred in houses of strict discipline and cultivated by the sense that failure to speak out against wrong would lead to damnation. Of course, their opponents found it difficult to reconcile such notions with monastic humility. The monks of Lorsch concur in this judgment, referring to the Hirsauer as Pharisees, whited sepulchers, and wolves in monks' clothing.²⁴

The reference to whited sepulchers and disguised wolves suggests that the monks of Hirsau had a very good reputation among the laity and perhaps other monasteries as well, a reputation of which the author of the *Carmen* must have been well aware. Thus the analyst of Augsburg complained bitterly that "gyrovagues, *wandering about under the guise of religion*, sowed discord everywhere."²⁵ These monks claimed to be acting in the name of true and proper religion, to judge by the reaction they produced. Such descriptions fit well with the known facts of the Hirsau community and world-friendly monks overall: a house of strict observance, going through most of the norms of Benedictine life with a flair that made them feel superior to other monks, but with a quirk, a feeling of responsibility for the world outside of the cloister that prayer alone could not satisfy. This desire to go into the world was polemical capital for antagonistic authors. Their critics recognized that much of the power of the monks of Hirsau lay in their reputation for intense spirituality, which of course could not be genuine because they were not stable and humble, so their lives contradicted traditional Benedictine mores. It just looked good, like a wolf in sheep's clothing or a whited sepulcher, but would lead to damnation of the monks and their supporters.

What really arouses the indignation of the author of the *Liber*, however, is not simply that these monks are politically active. He complains about the inflammatory writing coming from Hirsau, but

²³ Ibid., (II.38): 266, (II.41): 271. They or other unnamed public preachers are referred to as "modern scribes and pharisees." (II.13): 223-4.

²⁴ *Carmen Laur.*, (ll. 76-8, 88): 420.

²⁵ "Girovagi sub specie religionis discurrentes, maximam ubique seminant discordiam." *Annales Augustani* [a. 1075], p. 128. My emphasis.

concentrates his attack on the fact that Hirsau and its daughter houses sent out brethren to preach. Indeed, he carefully makes the point that the Hirsauer are not just active in their writing, but in all their deeds,²⁶ suggesting that the use of action rather than just words compounds their offenses. Both the subject of their preaching and the fact that they are doing so at all gives offense to the author.

In its most specific form, the complaint against the Hirsauer is that leaving the cloister is inimical to both the spirit and the letter of the Benedictine Rule. The case of humility is one open to interpretation, but in the case of uncloistered monks the anti-gregorian authors stood on firm ground. They had centuries of law and tradition to support them. Also, as their opponents did, they looked especially to the example of the early Christian centuries for arguments. On the one hand are what might be termed common sense arguments: the author of the *Liber* argues vehemently that monks simply ought to contain themselves "within the solitude of monasteries." Instead, these members of the community of Hirsau "have gone beyond the boundaries and institutions of the Fathers."²⁷ The author quite plainly knows what is right—he grew up in a world in which, although small groups and individuals sometimes acted in the broader Christian society, in general he could assume a definition of monk that included real separation from the world. No reason for turning against so much venerable authority could possibly be valid.

On the other hand, the lessons of the fourth and fifth centuries were still considered valid in this world view. Thus it was completely appropriate to denigrate the Hirsauer as latter-day *circumcelliones*.²⁸ Even more tellingly, the Lorsch writer turns the authority of the Benedictine Rule against monks who go out into the world to preach, drawing on Benedict's own vocabulary in an effort to damn his opponents as false monks. Thus they are gyrovagues, the author pinning on them that well-used derogatory term from the Benedictine Rule for wandering monks. In another snide reference to how poorly the Hirsauer follow the Rule, the author says that they are soft and malleable, "unlike gold that has been tested in the fire of the furnace,"²⁹ in a clear reference to the sarabaites of the Benedictine Rule

²⁶ *Liber de unitate*, (II.39): 267.

²⁷ "egressi sunt ultra terminos et constitutiones patrum." Ibid., (II.38): 266.

²⁸ Ibid., (II.41): 272–3.

²⁹ "Dissimiles auro fornacis in igne probato." *Carmen Laur.*, (l. 68): 420.

who followed their whims rather than any monastic law.³⁰ The monks of Hirsau were being tried particularly upon the scales of achievement they reached. On the other side of the balance was observance of the Benedictine Rule, especially as it had been interpreted by most churchmen since the ninth century. Or, more precisely, the critics drew their ammunition from a small collection of selected passages that emphasized stability, and the Hirsauer were found wanting.

The weight of monastic tradition as these polemicists knew it was against Hirsau's activities in the world, especially preaching. The greatest authority was the fourth canon of the council of Chalcedon (451), used repeatedly in ecclesiastical councils, especially from the time of Charlemagne on. This canon prohibited monks from wandering about in cities, but it can also be interpreted as monks having no right to wander at all. It was addressed especially to the problem of monks setting themselves up as authorities in opposition to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and therefore was very appropriate for the crisis of the late eleventh century. According to Chalcedon, monks should stay quietly in their cloisters, *not* preach or otherwise interfere with the workings of secular society.³¹ Hallowed as it was by imperial and ecclesiastical authority, as well as the weight of centuries, the argument of Chalcedon was a difficult one for active monks to answer. That Chalcedon plays a particularly central role in the polemics of the Investiture Contest shows not only that advances had been made in spreading knowledge of canon law, but also that these canons could be used against, as well as for, the papal movement.

Bernoldus of Constance, originally a monk of St. Blasien, did attempt a defense of preaching monks that tried to challenge the interpretation imperialists employed of Chalcedon's provisions. He insists that the canon of Chalcedon against monks preaching no longer applies to his age—modern monks hold ecclesiastical orders, so they have as much right to preach as any clerics. In other words, as did so many other monks involved in ecclesiastical reform, Bernoldus in his justification is at pains to blur the distinctions that made monks unique in society. For his argument to work, instead of facing a situation of monks who happened to be ordained to the priesthood for a variety of reasons, these preachers of reform are clerics who happen also to

³⁰ RB 1.6–9.

³¹ *Liber de unitate*, (II.38): 266.

be monks. He also makes an argument that shows the new lines of authority and obedience that were being drawn in the trials of the Investiture Contest. These preaching monks, as he says, are preaching under the authority of the apostolic see. The pope has the right to command their obedience in this matter. Therefore it does not matter if they infringe on diocesan authority or even go beyond the usual confines of Benedictine observance: the papal license is superior to such matters.³²

Clearly battle lines had been drawn by this time between active and traditional monastic values. We have seen most of the arguments before; but now they are all brought together in carefully reasoned statements of position. The monks of Lorsch in their appeal claim that they, rather than the Hirsauer, are the good monks, precisely because they work in the cloisters, keeping the rules of the fathers and the rites that they had inherited from their predecessors, while their enemies from Hirsau left their cloisters and went wandering about the world. What the monks ask for in their complaint is to be allowed to restore their monastery to the normal customs of monasticism in Germany, and to those of Benedict of Nursia.³³ From the context, it is not possible that the Lorsch author is referring simply to the imposition of Hirsauer-Cluniac customs. The stick with which Lorsch feels able to attack Hirsau is precisely its stand in favor of papal reform.

One should remember that, although these two treatises were directed against the monks of Hirsau, they themselves hint at a larger rift within monasticism. The wealth of information these two authors provide can easily lead one to believe that Hirsau was alone in a hostile landscape. The best corrective to this view is to examine the more theoretical statements about the proper role of monks in general that can also be found in the propaganda of the Investiture Contest. These statements focus especially on the life and activities of Pope Gregory VII.

³² Bernoldus, (V): 97–98. Bernoldus of Constance wrote some time between 1086 and 1100.

³³ *Carmen Laur.*, (ll. 122–3): 421, (ll. 138–141): 422. See also Horst Fuhrmann, "Das Papsttum zwischen Frömmigkeit und Politik—Urban II. (1088–1099) und die Frage der Selbstheiligung," in *Deus qui mutat tempora*, ed. Ernst-Dieter Hehl, et al. (Sigmaringen, 1987), p. 160.

iii. *The disavowal of a radical past*

In general, as far as the Benedictines are concerned, it must be admitted that on the whole the traditional view won. Hirsau's later history gives suggestive evidence of this, for there is a very interesting twist in their own historiographical tradition. If it were not for the imperial polemicists examined above, we would know next to nothing about the activities of the Hirsauer as wandering preachers and agitators for reform—they say very little about it in their own accounts, even though material exists in which this information would have found a natural place. These accounts, both historical and hagiographical, were all written in the 1090's or later and appear to reflect a conscious decision not to include many of the world-embracing elements that were the focus of indignation for their enemies.

There is just enough evidence in the Hirsau record to give credence to the accusations made against them in the *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda* and the *Carmen Laureshamense*. The *vita* of Theoger of St. George's in the Black Forest, a late Hirsauer account written after 1120, tells how its protagonist sent monks out during the Investiture Contest.³⁴ This reference at least assumes that Hirsau monks traveled, although it does not specify that they were in fact traveling as preachers and political agitators for the Gregorian cause.

In general, however, Gregorian accounts, and specifically Hirsau accounts, say little about the monastery's active role in the Investiture Contest, a role one might think they would have viewed with pride. Even the abbots, traditionally granted a larger role in hagiographical sources, both as important nobles and as saints who are not bound by the strict rules of monastic behavior, are not shown as very active on the public, political front. Even Abbot William himself does not appear as a particularly inflammatory figure. As I have mentioned, the *vita* of Gregory VII calls William of Hirsau one of the most zealous reforming monks of the age.³⁵ Still, zeal for reform, as this passage implies, especially for monastic reform, is a far cry from acting as a public preacher for the papal cause. Indeed, Haimo's *vita* of William of Hirsau, written soon after the hero's death in 1091, speaks only in very general terms about William's role in the papal reform movement, and never refers to public preaching either by

³⁴ *Vita Theogeri*, (I.29): 463.

³⁵ Brackmann, p. 9.

him or his monks. Instead, the strongest statements the hagiographer provides are how William, "inflamed with the fire of divine love," was moved to hold and serve the unity of the Church with "salubrious counsel."³⁶ While there are hints in this account that William went beyond offering good advice—being inflamed with divine love suggests a certain vehemence of action—Haimo chooses not to be more specific about his abbot's actions. He describes William winning laypeople to a monastic life, but not specifically to a pro-papal one. Similarly, Theoger of St. George's was apparently a wandering Hirsau preacher before becoming abbot, but the *vita's* author does not develop this role.³⁷

Instead, the monks of Hirsau who reflected on the life of their community took great pains to show how quiet and cloistered the monks were, even while participating in the Investiture Contest. The *Historia Hirsaugiensis*, an account of the community's history written by a monk who had known Abbot William, speaks of the monastery's role as a place of refuge during the German wars. Its author claims that under William the house, acting as an "asylum," grew to more than 150 monks, besides a multitude of lay brethren.³⁸ He attributes their abilities to spread a monastic lifestyle firmly to the strength of Hirsau's own religious discipline—Hirsau was one of three places to which laymen could go to seek "angelic perfection."³⁹ Similarly, Urban II in 1091 praised the Swabian reform circle, including Hirsau, for its efforts in drawing the laity to the common life of the primitive Church.⁴⁰

In all of these instances, the avowed activity of the monks was to help less enlightened people *out* of the world, not to involve themselves *in* the activities of the world. While monks may have gone out preaching to draw the laypeople in, form semi-monastic village communities, etc., these sources favorable to Hirsau do not choose to mention it.

Other Hirsauer sources drum home the message that, by typical monastic reckoning of the eleventh century, Hirsau and its daughter

³⁶ "igne divini amoris totus incanduerat ac zelo animarum aestuabat, salubri consilio quosque ad unitatem ecclesiae tenendam servandamque animabat." Haimo, (5): 213.

³⁷ See Schnitzer, p. 112.

³⁸ *Historia Hirsaugiensis monasterii*, (3): 256.

³⁹ The other two were St. Blasien and St. Salvator at Sceffhusin. See Bernold [a. 1083], p. 439.

⁴⁰ Hallinger, "Laienbrüder," p. 85.

houses are filled with ideal monks. Thus the customs of Hirsau, assembled by Abbot William, say little about any monastic contact with the world outside of the cloister. They do indeed order that a monk outside the monastery should only hear the mass of a known priest, a reflection of Hirsau's reform orientation, but do not specify reasons for the monk to be in the world in the first place.

Why did the monks of Hirsau want to draw away from their "evangelical" heritage, to forget that they had in the recent past gone out preaching for what they considered a godly cause? Some answers can be found in the criticisms brought against them in the *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda* and the *Carmen Laurehamense*. According to the Benedictine Rule and its contemporary interpretation, the Hirsau monks were simply acting wrongly. While they might win popular approval by their actions, monks could not ignore the criticisms of an elite of which they were themselves a part. The only options left to them were a reaffirmation of traditional monastic standards or a clear break with the past and a new beginning. The Hirsauer, as can be seen in their hagiography, chose the former. The parallels to Vallombrosa are striking. As with the Vallombrosans, there was a conscious rewriting of the early history of Hirsau, to make it conform more closely to the ideals of Benedictine life expressed by its detractors. This suggests that the weight of educated ecclesiastical opinion, at least after the first throes of the Investiture Controversy had calmed, lay with a traditional interpretation of the Benedictine Rule, rather than with the world-serving elements within Benedictinism.

Were it not for their enemies, we would know next to nothing of Hirsauer boldness in the world, and would be content to see monks of the second half of the eleventh century in the typical Benedictine mold of cloistered prayer. There could have been many other monks, individuals and whole communities, involved in the work of preaching. After all, somehow the Gregorian message was spread to a broad spectrum of western European society. But since we have a substantial body of information about Hirsau preaching, the few references that exist tend to be attributed to Hirsau. Thus the course of the Hirsauer is seen as an anomaly, rather than as representative of the turmoil of monks, torn as they were between centuries of emphasis on withdrawal from the affairs of the world and the perceived Christian duty to speak out for the cause they believed to be right.

In the 1070's, when the Hirsauer began their preaching, there was clearly a difference in opinion about the appropriate sphere of

activity for monks. Those who suffered from Hirsauer activity were quick to draw on the discontent that already existed, shaping it into a considerable arsenal of arguments against monastic preaching and involvement with such a highly charged religious and political issue as the Investiture Contest. The Hirsauer themselves, though, were able to combine a strict rule and discipline with the activity of at least some of their monks on the preaching field. Indeed, the discipline in their daily lives appears to have been perceived by them and at least some of the public as a moral seal of approval and imperative for their activities in the world. By 1091 or 1092 at the latest, when Haimo wrote the *vita* of William of Hirsau, there was a cover-up of this extra-claustral phase in the community's life. Apparently, the Hirsau monks wanted to de-emphasize their role as political agitators at the same time that their critics were launching the attacks that I have discussed. The Vallombrosans rewrote their history to show themselves as more acceptable Benedictines; Hirsau did the same.

Johannes von Walter, in a statement that has never been contested, placed the preaching monks of Hirsau on a direct line of development that progressed to the early twelfth-century wandering preachers of France, and from them to the Franciscans.⁴¹ However, this promising offshoot from the Benedictine stem died a quick death, arguably because of the weight of custom and expectation that rested upon Benedictine monks. When the Hirsauer looked to biblical models of preaching and teaching for their inspiration, they opened themselves to accusations of being bad monks, because of the very nature of the profession they had made in accordance with the Benedictine Rule. For the real origins of groups like the Franciscans, one must look to the new, non-Benedictine congregations, who acknowledged this irreconcilable tension in the Rule and its interpretation, and turned instead to new paths.

iv. *Hildebrand the false monk*

If one uses a narrow definition, the cause of all the trouble between pope and emperor was the monk Hildebrand, archdeacon of the Roman Church and pope from 1073 to 1085 under the name Gregory

⁴¹ See Johannes von Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs* (Leipzig, 1903, 1906) 1: 6.

VII. Probably the best-known piece of medieval invective is the opening imperial blow of the Investiture Contest. In his letter of 1076 denouncing Gregory VII's inflammatory actions, Henry IV attacks the pope as: "Hildebrand, not pope by God's ordination, but false monk," and calls on Gregory to descend from the papal throne.⁴² Thus from the very beginning of their campaign against the Gregorian reformers, imperialists brought up the fact that Gregory was a professed monk, arguing that he had morally compromised himself by acting in a non-monastic way, and thus could not legitimately be pope. To them he was Hildebrand the false monk, rather than Gregory VII, the duly elected reforming pontiff.

This complaint of the imperial propagandists—that Gregory was a "false monk"—deserves more attention than it has received from historians. Gregory's enemies tried to weaken his credibility by calling him an unruly monk. Meanwhile the defenders of Gregory, while trying to answer these reproaches, presented a new vision of proper Benedictinism. His supporters defend Gregory as a true monk, as one who had been faithful to his calling and profession. A comparison of these attacks and defenses show in stark relief the attitudes of the best-educated portion of society in the late eleventh century about appropriate monastic behavior. Apparently a fissure had opened between different conceptions of monks' role in Christian society.

The imperial propagandists obviously found the label "monk" convenient for defaming Hildebrand the monk (Gregory VII), and by implication, his monastic supporters. To Henry IV he is a "false monk." Benzo of Alba calls Gregory a "little monk,"⁴³ the derogatory diminutive adding an additional sense of contempt that a monk could have become pope. Another imperial supporter, Peter Crassus, one of Gregory's most detailed character-slaughterers, always speaks of the reforming pope as "*I. [Ildebrandus] the monk*," or as "that monk."⁴⁴

These authors are not simply insulting their opponent as "monk" because they held the monastic institution in low regard, as in the generation before when Bardo of Mainz was insulted at the royal

⁴² Text given in Karl Morrison, ed. *The Investiture Controversy: Issues, Ideals, and Results* (New York, 1971), pp. 48–49.

⁴³ See Alois Fauser, *Die Publizisten des Investiturstreites: Persönlichkeiten und Ideen* (Würzburg, 1935), p. 99.

⁴⁴ "*I. monachus*," or "*monachus ille*." See for example, Petrus Crassus, *Defensio Heinrici IV. regis*, MGH LL 1, (4): 438–439.

court after his election to the archiepiscopate as "that little monk" who should return to his "little monastery."⁴⁵ The imperial propagandists are not attacking monasticism itself as being of little value. Instead, they are unanimous in asserting that monasticism as an institution is precious and holy. Thus, for example, the author of the *Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*, probably the most reflective of the anti-Gregorian writers, describes the position of the monk as a form of mystery and the monastic habit as sacramental.⁴⁶ Some polemicists on the imperial side were themselves monks, yet another reason why they were unlikely to insult Benedictine monasticism as a whole. The key to determining what makes this an insult lies in the designation of Gregory as a *false* monk. Those who see the monastic life as a sacrament and mystery are unlikely to take kindly to a mixing of monastic functions with those of a more worldly nature. As we will see, these imperial propagandists have a clear conception of what makes a good monk, with full explanations of how egregiously Gregory fails to live up to that image. What is more, their ideal image of a monk fits well both with the standard monastic literature of the ninth and tenth centuries, and with the criticisms that we have already examined against monks working in the world.

What is at work here is not an effort to limit monastic involvement because developments in the secular clergy had made monks unnecessary in worldly positions. It is true that the early eleventh century saw a reduction in the number of monks chosen for the episcopate, as the German emperors very often favored members of their own court chapel.⁴⁷ But none of the imperial propagandists in the Investiture Contest suggest that monks should not become bishops. On the contrary, most of the propagandists are pointed in their comparisons of Gregory VII with his namesake, the *good* monk-pope Gregory I. The issue for them is not that a monk should have become pope. Instead, what they point out is that the means by which the monk Hildebrand rose to power betrayed his profession. It is particularly on Hildebrand *as monk* that they focus.

At the most basic level, imperialists complained that Hildebrand

⁴⁵ *Vita Bardonis maior*, MGH SS 11, (15): 329. The courtiers on a visit Bardo made to the royal court called Bardo a "rustic little monk."

⁴⁶ *Liber de unitate*, (II.42): 277. Used by Jean Leclercq in "La crise du monachisme aux XI^e et XII^e siècles" *Bullettino dell'istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo* 70 (1958): 23.

⁴⁷ See Josef Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, vol. 2, MGH Schriften 16/2 (Stuttgart, 1966).

was unmonkish because he sowed discord in the world. For example, Wido, writing at the request of the antipope Clement, tells how Hildebrand's action had divided the Christian world down the middle: "The Christian people are divided into two parts, some saying that he is good, the others however calling him impostor and *antimonk* and antichrist,"⁴⁸ specifically linking discord to his poor monastic observance. Similarly, Beno explains that the so-called Gregorian reform is really a ploy of the devil, who attacks "through a false monk, appearing innocuous under the monastic habit he only donned for expediency and under the pretense of religion, so that he might fraudulently arrange to subvert the name of Christ," since there were no pagans available through whom the devil could attack the Christian people.⁴⁹ Clearly a true monk, according to antigregorian writers, should be peaceable, not a divisive force.

This passage in Beno's treatise reinforces the difference in the two parties' understanding of the appropriate monastic state. As did other active monks in the eleventh century, Hildebrand appears to have clearly identified himself as a monk, claiming to act in the world in God's name. Beno's passage suggests that, rather than distancing himself from his monastic profession when he was first made archdeacon of the Roman Church and later pope, Hildebrand continued to emphasize that he was a monk. We know from other sources that Gregory continued to wear the monastic habit as pope, as plain a statement as it was possible to make that he felt himself to be a monk.⁵⁰ Calculated or not, he identified himself thus with the popular esteem in which monks were held and proclaimed his solidarity with the monks of the eleventh century who were actively involved in the world. If this esteem and concern about monks was no longer present in educated society, the propagandists would not have made

⁴⁸ "Divisus est populus Christianus in duo, aliis dicentibus, quia bonus est, aliis autem vocantibus eum impostorem et antimonachum et antichristianum." Emphasis mine. Wido episcopus Ferrariensis, *De scismate Hildebrandi*, MGH LL 1, (I.2): 535. Cf. the more general statements about Gregory as the cause of discord in *Liber de unitate*, (I.1): 184–85. It is interesting that the author of the *Liber* draws on the language of Christian love in his argument—the unity of the Church is sustained by *caritas*, and by its common end in heaven. The implication is that Gregory, far from acting out of *caritas*, is really its enemy.

⁴⁹ "per falsum monachum sub habitu monastico, sub specie religionis, nomen Christi fraudulenter subvertere disponebat." Beno alique cardinales schismatics, *Contra Gregorium VII. et Urbanum II. scripta*, MGH LL 2, (II.6): 377.

⁵⁰ Raffaello Morghen, *Gregorio VII. e la riforma della Chiesa nel secolo XI* (revised ed. Palermo, 1974), p. 159.

such complaints about Gregory. As in the case of the Vallombrosans, Gregory would appear to have had an impressive "pretense" of holiness based on a monastic appearance, that would inspire the populace to venerate him as a man of God. This fits very well into the pattern of the active monks we have been studying, who were at the lower end of the hierarchy.

For Beno and others, Hildebrand is not just a poor monk—he is a traitor to his monastic vows. The issue is, not surprisingly, one of contact with the world. He had left his monastery. Beno, before the passage cited above, describes how Hildebrand, "having abandoned the monastery" (*derelecto monasterio*), attached himself to the archpriest John Gratian, who later became Pope Gregory VI.⁵¹ More specifically, Hildebrand had abandoned his monastery purely out of ambition. He had shown his contempt for ecclesiastical discipline first by moving from the monastery to papal service and thence to the chair of St. Peter. Again, the imperial polemicists found it useful to compare Gregory VII's life and work to that of Gregory the Great. Peter Crassus was careful to point out that the contemporary situation was not analogous to that of Gregory I. The key point of distinction was Hildebrand's state of mind while accepting ever higher offices in the curia. Thus, several clear debates about intentionality again anticipated twelfth-century scholars such as Peter Abelard. Gregory I had been "violently removed" from his monastery by the pope and forced into papal service. This, Peter Crassus stresses, is the only legitimate way to leave a Benedictine monastery, both by episcopal decree and the provisions of the council of Chalcedon. Because Hildebrand looked for a way to leave his monastery and enter papal service, he was lawfully excommunicate—and how could an excommunicate become a legitimate pope?⁵² Wenricus also emphasizes that at the heart of Hildebrand's sin was his act of self-will in abandoning the cloister in the first place: "First, they say, having left the monastery of his own will, so much did he [consider] stability, the first sacrament of that militia to which he bound himself by his profession, that there were few cities in Italy, Germany, or Gaul that he did not quickly pass through, and few of their princes whom he did not meet within a short time."⁵³ Stability, defined as physical restriction to a single

⁵¹ Beno, (II.6): 377.

⁵² Petrus Crassus, (5): 443.

⁵³ "Primum quidem suo, ut aiunt, arbitrio monasterium egressus, tanta se stabilitate,

location, has thus been elevated through this controversy to the importance of a sacrament, the keystone of monastic life.

To emphasize, the imperialists did not see acceptance of higher rank as by itself an offense against the dictates of the Benedictine Rule. So both sides of the polemic focused on the argument of Gregory's intentions. The state of mind is the deciding factor, as we have already seen on a smaller scale in apologiae of monks working in the world. For the propagandists, though, an important part of the definition of monk is that monks have given up self-will. For a monk to choose one course of action over another in itself shows an excessive concern with the world and its values. Thus, the only legitimate monk-office holder is one who had been drafted and dragged kicking to his consecration. By ninth- to eleventh-century monastic standards, the monk Hildebrand was indeed on ambiguous ground. Much depended on the reasons behind leaving the monastery: leaving from self-will or for self-glorification was unacceptable, but leaving at the command of a secular ruler or bishop was approved. There is no place in the imperial party, using traditional Benedictine monastic theology, for a monk who feels a compulsion to act in the world and willingly puts himself into a position to support a cause, even one much more worthy of his endeavors than the papal reform movement.

Instead of recognizing and dealing in some way with the ambiguity of this situation, in which a monk can act for good only against his will, the imperial propagandists present a single picture to the world. The only option for monks is the strict interpretation of the Benedictine Rule by ninth-century standards, with a choice between adhering to the vow of stability as a state of physical withdrawal or holding ecclesiastical office by compulsion. Thus while Hildebrand certainly considered himself a monk throughout his life, he was, to these hostile eyes, violating his profession. Peter Crassus explains Hildebrand's alleged sin the best. He quotes chapter 58 of the Benedictine Rule, the chapter dealing with profession, to emphasize the permanent nature of all vows. Peter, however, provides an interpretation that goes beyond the original, stating that from the day of

quod primum est militiae illius sacramentum, professionis suae devinxit, ut paucae sint Italiae, Germaniae vel Galliae urbes, quas non celeriter percurrerit, pauci temporis illius principes, quos non salutaverit." Wenricus scolasticus Trevirensis, *Epistola sub Theoderici episcopi Viridunensis nomine composita*, MGH LL 1, (2): 286.

profession the new monk not only cannot leave the "yoke of the Rule," but also cannot leave the monastery. He presents a strict view of stability to the monastery that seems to imply permanence in the house of profession, a point by no means clear before this time in the monastic tradition. Peter Crassus argues that Hildebrand has broken precisely that part of the Rule. He went out into the world to follow his own way instead of the monastic rule "and [he] to whom power over his own body ought to be forbidden, embraced power over the whole world." Peter is quick to explain to his readers that the would-be pope was therefore guilty not only of disobedience and violation of his vows but also of sacrilege, since instead of giving everything he possessed to his monastery he had stolen his own self, no longer his property, away from it.⁵⁴ Thus Peter returns again and again to the traditional interpretation of monasticism as the voluntary rejection of self-will and power of independent action. The monk should lose himself in his identification with the community. No room is left for independent action at the dictates of one's own conscience.

Wido also tells how Hildebrand was against "the Rule of the holy fathers" (*sanctorum patrum regulam*) from his youth. Although he was "called a monk" from adolescence, he became involved in the bureaucracy of the Roman church at an early age. In that capacity he studied warfare, was involved in homicides, polluted himself with sacrilege, and perjured himself (an interesting statement on conditions in the papacy before and during its reform). He even ran an army as archdeacon of the Roman Church. Although Wido acknowledged that this was "under the pretense of defending and liberating the Roman Church," he argues that even if this were true it would not justify Hildebrand. After all, he argues, citing Jerome, the Church should suffer in patience, not fight back.⁵⁵

The themes of pretense and the false guise of piety occur so commonly among critics of active monks that their significance must be considered. First, it is a public admission that "false monks" like Gregory claim to be acting rightly, and indeed attract others with their obvious sincerity and piety. Since the basic ground of complaint is that these monks are working actively in the world, in this case for ecclesiastical reform, they must have been asserting that this

⁵⁴ Petrus Crassus, (5): 441.

⁵⁵ "et quasi sub specie defendendi et liberandi Romanam ecclesiam satellitium fecit." Wido, (II): 554.

action was, at least under some circumstances, appropriate to a monk. In other words, avoidance of the world is not an absolute requirement, and must be regarded as only one of a variety of considerations to take into account when contemplating action. And it is precisely this point that their opponents will not accept. The argument between the two parties hinges upon their valuation of the world and the place of monks in it.

Although Wido does not emphasize the monastic issue in his complaints, pointing instead to the general malaise of a papacy that has turned away from true Christianity to aggression, his fellow propagandist Wenricus does. He explains that before becoming pope Hildebrand was engaged in secular things, so that he retained only the monk's habit rather than habits, and even the habit was made of too fine a material for a monk.⁵⁶ Again, at the hands of the antigregorian writers, as with all good propagandists, very clear black-and-white distinctions have been made where before there was considerable room for interpretation and modification for particular circumstances. Certain acts are simply defiling for a monk, no matter what the purpose behind them. The reference to Hildebrand's excessive finery makes an interesting connection to earlier polemical works. The outside trimmings express the essence of the monk within. Therefore, if he dresses well, he must be subject to excessive pride or vainglory.

Hildebrand's offenses were compounded by his instability, according to the imperial propagandists. They labeled him as a *sarabaites*. This put the worst possible construction on Hildebrand's travels on ecclesiastical business, equating him with this derogatory term to grubby monks and pseudo-monks who tramped the roads avoiding ecclesiastical discipline.⁵⁷ Again the propagandists are making a clear statement about what they consider to be the proper role of a monk. To serve their purpose of attacking the Gregorians, they are taking rather vague and not very clearly defined customs and attitudes that monks really ought not involve themselves with the world and are rendering them into a stark contrast between good and evil. They are also concentrating and honing vague discontent against the world-friendly movement within monasticism and giving their conservative views axiomatic force. Plainly and simply, a monk should not wander. He should be stable, not gad about even on praiseworthy papal business.

⁵⁶ Wenricus, (2): 286–87.

⁵⁷ Petrus Crassus, (5): 441.

v. *The case for Gregory*

The propagandists on the Gregorian side of the Investiture Contest acknowledged the seriousness of these criticisms by providing carefully considered responses. The problem was how to present Gregory as a true monk and yet as a leader of the western Church. They were limited in their depictions of Gregory as an exemplary monk by several centuries of Benedictine tradition that tended to support the arguments of their opponents. Thus they could not simply argue that the antigregorians had things backwards, and that it was always praiseworthy for monks to play an active role in the world. Instead, like other monks earlier in the century who had had to find a niche for themselves within the Benedictine tradition, they adopted a more nuanced approach, arguing that *occasionally*, and for a good cause, it could be appropriate for monks to take a place on the larger stage of the world. On the whole they continued to work with the limitations of that Benedictine tradition, emphasizing the exceptional circumstances that would permissibly draw a monk out of the cloister.⁵⁸ Nevertheless, at the heart of the Gregorian position is a significant reevaluation of the position of monks in Christian society. These pro-Gregorian writers are the best spokesmen that monks ever found to justify their activity in the world. Their degree of failure in making a convincing case for Gregory as a monk marks a major turning point in the history of specifically "Benedictine" monasticism. The constraints of Benedictine tradition would not allow them to laud the essential newness of the monastic life that had come to full light with Gregory. Their failure prepared the way for other individuals seeking diversity from the established ideology to turn to new religious groups and new monastic authorities for satisfaction.

Manegold of Lautenbach is especially cautious in drawing on historical examples to legitimize Gregory's travel to various cities after becoming a monk. Throughout history, he argues, ecclesiastical leaders have relied on emissaries, often monks, who have served them in a spirit of obedience, and thus, he implies, not from ambition or pride. In looking specifically at Hildebrand as a monk, according to Manegold, all must realize that it is necessary for the pope to know

⁵⁸ An interesting comparison is the way the arguments of the imperial propagandists were limited because none of them questioned the pope's claim to the power to bind and loose that was granted to Peter in Mt 16.18-20.

the ways of various peoples so he can deal with them. Hildebrand was one of the pope's emissaries before he became pope himself. He acted rightly since the popes he served *sent* him, as a trusted man who would work for the papacy abroad. Gregory, far from being a sarabaite, was following the example of the Fathers. For example, Paul sent Timothy on his travels, and the future Gregory I left his monastery on the pope's orders to become a legate to Constantinople, just as Gregory I sent Augustine to England. Why, Manegold asks, reproach Gregory VII and not the venerated Gregory I?⁵⁹ Manegold cites other pre-Merovingian figures to support his argument. It is interesting, though, that he does not draw from recent history. He could not very well approve of imperial use of monks, because his party was opposed to such lay interference in religious life. And papal claims to the service of all members of the clergy, including monks, were too recent to have created much of a precedent.

Thus far Manegold's argument simply refutes the imperial polemicists' assertions. Indeed, he hardly deals with Gregory as a follower of the Benedictine Rule at all, focusing predominantly on Gregory as a good Christian. Still, this forces him to consider at times the issue of whether Gregory was a true monk. The opposition says Gregory was acting from self-will; Manegold argues that Hildebrand is loyal to the Benedictine tradition because he became involved in papal affairs only out of a spirit of obedience. One can see no change in ideology here to justify a monk acting in the world on his own account. This argument of obedience exposes the Gregorian party's own uneasiness with the thought of a monk like Hildebrand acting on his own initiative. By using the argument of obedience, they defend Gregory, but at the expense of the principle of activity in the world. Bertholdus even took refuge in invention to defend his monk-pope, trying very hard to bring the events of his pope's life into conformity with the life of Gregory the Great, especially in his election to the pontificate. So Bertholdus tells us that Gregory tried to flee and hide to escape election in 1073, in language very reminiscent of the descriptions of Gregory I's election to the pontificate that appear in his well-known *vita*.⁶⁰ In other words, through an exercise in creative writing, Hildebrand/Gregory was made to fit within the traditional parameters of monastic behavior.

⁵⁹ Manegoldus, *Ad Gebhardum liber*, MGH LL 1, (10): 329–31.

⁶⁰ Bertholdus, *Annales*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1073], p. 276.

vi. *The monastic ordo and Christianity*

Some Gregorian authors present a more radical interpretation of proper monastic behavior toward the world while answering this charge of willfulness, an interpretation that fits well into the tradition of defenses of and by monks acting in the world. Manegold of Lautenbach quotes Isaiah 6. 8, in which God asks the prophet "Whom shall I send?" and Isaiah responds to the implicit call. The author likens Gregory to the prophet, and argues that he is to be praised for traveling so much in order to be useful to the Church, giving up his *private quiet* for the greater good.⁶¹ The view that the monastic life is a life of quiet retreat, as we have seen earlier, is too deeply ingrained to be displaced. To that extent, the core of Benedictine ideology remains substantially unchanged. Still, quiet withdrawal for Manegold and, of course, for Gregory himself if one accepts Manegold's arguments, is not the be all and end all of monastic life, as it was for monks like Peter Damian. There is a superior call by authority or divine inspiration, and to ignore it would be a greater betrayal than failure to adhere to the letter of monastic custom.

Like any other Christian, monks have a duty to serve the greater cause of Christianity in whatever way they are called to do so. This duty is no longer specifically defined as retreat and prayer, as it had been in Carolingian monastic ideology, although that was of course still an option. But in this cautious defense of monks in the world, the chasm between monks and other Christians has largely dissolved. What was important to Gregory was, in the final analysis, not his adherence to a monastic ideology, but his Christianity and the position of authority in which he found himself. It is symptomatic of his active stance toward the world that he did not feel a need to choose between the parts of his life, as a monk who nevertheless provided the driving force behind the papally-led reform movement, although his enemies pointed to the incongruity of Gregory's life in terms of tradition. While Gregorian supporters were forced to defend Gregory against the charge of being a "false monk," the monastic issue was hardly central to the ideology of the ecclesiastical reform. The implication arises that a monk is likely to be a particularly apt tool for the needs of the Church, because of his superior personal holiness and life of religious commitment—the "pretense of religion"

⁶¹ Manegoldus, (10): 332.

pointed to by the imperial polemicists—but the strict definition of “monk” is largely subsumed by a broad definition of “Christian.” A monk is neither better nor worse in the cause of reform than is any other Christian who is in the right place at the right time, although prestigious abbots, active monasteries, hermits, and recluses were probably able to draw more people to reforming thought—people who reject the world and live ascetically were still considered the religious elite, with a direct line of communication to God.

The polemics surrounding both the monk Hildebrand and his supporters at Hirsau tell us a great deal about the monastic transition of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. While fighting with their pens between imperial and papal claims, the polemicists also drew a much clearer line between the two dominant views on the correct monastic life. In this literary side of the Investiture Contest, monasticism was drawn much more deeply than hitherto into the web of classification and clarification that was progressing rapidly in learned circles. More than at any earlier period in the history of monasticism, there was an effort to define the attitudes and assumptions that underlay the monastic establishment—to decide what was and what was not acceptable behavior. The problem was that those doing the defining followed very different agendas, and were not willing or able to seek out common ground, setting the stage for the misunderstandings and speaking at cross purposes of the monastic and monk-canon controversies of the next two generations. The Investiture Contest’s structure helped place the question of how much legitimate activity a monk could undertake in the world surrounding the cloister the issue at the center of this polemical debate over the meaning of monastic vows. These first clear and clearly widespread voices in the debate that marks the so-called “monastic crisis” were not particularly interested in poverty, education, or the inner spiritual lives of monks. What they were clarifying even as they fought over it was a basic issue in the definition of what it meant to be a monk. Should monasticism be defined as withdrawal from the world and its needs as well as its temptations, in other words the old view that the world is unsafe for monks? Or could and should monks like Gregory VII and the Hirsauer, like any other Christian, play an active role in aiding the greater Christian world?

At their heart, the criticisms leveled against the monks who were actively engaged in the Investiture Conflict reflect the ongoing strength of traditionally interpreted Benedictine ideals in the late eleventh

century. Monasticism underwent a process of definition at the hands of Investiture Contest propagandists, as did other key concepts such as "*ecclesia*" or the nature of "*Christianitas*" itself. In the case of monks, both the preaching Gregorian monks and their critics quickly came to a clear sense of what it meant to be a *Benedictine* monk, guided by more than two centuries of monolithic Benedictine monasticism as the ideal holy life. The weight of both tradition and written custom forcefully drove home to monks the message that claustration, prayer, and a carefully organized ritual existence were what set monks off from the rest of Christian society. They turned from apostolic preaching back to that model even in the midst of the Investiture Contest, well before an effective papal control in Germany could have forced them to conformity with Urban II's notions of appropriate monastic behavior.

CONCLUSION

The polemics of the Investiture Contest produced two fully articulated and largely contradictory statements about the role of monks in the world. But the nature of the struggle also gave a focus to monks who wanted to serve in the world, and, to at least some, appeared to provide a justification. In the years covered by this study, the number of monks involved was probably quite small—people willing to flout tradition are rare in any society. The fact that it has been possible to trace as many monks as I have in a period with so few extant documents suggests that the phenomenon may have been larger than appears here. Certainly, secular opinion and the writing especially of the polemicists of the Investiture Contest presented a new world of choice. Once a few brave men and their followers arranged the alternatives to traditional Benedictine life, the doors were open to several new religious options, often a new monastery or canonry with different goals and emphases. Thus, besides the ground breakers such as the Vallombrosans, in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries we find new organizations that begin with the zeal of converts and that make up their own foundation myth, usually that of return to the “pure” Benedictine Rule. The question was how much of the traditional additions should be retained, and even what part of the Rule should be emphasized or reinterpreted.

The twelfth century was a time in which the new congregations learned to organize themselves, and interpret both their past and present conditions. It is then, when there was already a framework of Benedictines who stayed in the traditionalist fold and a looser group of religious houses that were trying out new plans and rules, some impossible to maintain, some even branded as heretical, that the real arguments about which form of life is the “best” began to appear. This would not have been possible without a common vocabulary and a shared experience of the Gregorian reform, which, even if they did not support it, brought out new notions of authority and turned lay eyes toward religious establishments.

During the Investiture Contest monks tended to be involved in reform as individuals; only in a few cases do we know of whole monasteries or congregations caught up in an active role supporting the

issues of the ecclesiastical reform. In the political division of the empire there was too much disagreement over the issues themselves, and too much disagreement over the form of action monks should properly take in broad Church policy, for total agreement within any group to be expected. Several cases are known in which one party within a monastery drove out partisans of the other party, and probably others occurred for which evidence no longer exists. Zeal for the papal party or even agreement with the program against simony and clerical marriage was certainly not a natural corollary of membership in a pro-papal monastery in most cases.¹

Individual monks gradually imposed a Gregorian view of the world upon the laity and secular clergy. Perhaps even more important, it was to the pope they turned for authority in many cases, rather than to local bishops or nobles. One of the few independent preachers for Church reform about whom we know any details is Ramihrdus of Cambrai, who died in 1077, the same year his more conservative fellow-monk Hugh of Cluny negotiated peace between emperor and pope at Canossa. Ramihrdus preached reform of the Church, not bothering with special licenses, but just wandering and preaching wherever it seemed appropriate. As far as we can tell at this distance in time, the subject of his lessons was the fight against simony and nicolaitism. His critics brought Ramihrdus before the bishop, who found him sound in issues of doctrine. Nevertheless, when the real test came, to receive the Eucharist from the bishop or one of his clergy, Ramihrdus refused, because he believed, as did many, that simony had tainted the consecrated elements. In the resulting uproar, the bishop's servants took him out and burned him as a heretic. In this case, Ramihrdus was almost certainly an ecclesiastical reformer who saw things too black-and-white, as did many of his fellows, and refused the sacrament because Gregory VII had urged

¹ Semmler points out that members of the Siegburg reform were often the truest supporters of Henry IV in the Investiture Contest. Josef Semmler, *Die Klosterreform von Siegburg* (Bonn, 1959), p. 258. St. Blasien, another leading reform monastery, managed to live at peace under a royalist bishop. Heinrich Büttner, "St. Blasien und das Bistum Basel im 11./12. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites" *ZS für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 44 (1950): 144-45. Even Hirsau, the most zealous supporter of Gregory VII, was willing to reform monasteries belonging to supporters of Henry IV. This has led to the conclusion that the monastic and canonical reform programs remained largely neutral in the Investiture Contest. See Josef Semmler, "Klosterreform und gregorianische Reform: Die Chorherrenstifter Marbach und Hördt im Investiturstreit" *StGreg* 6 (1959-1961): 171-72.

godly men to avoid masses sung by simoniacs.² Free speech was such a dangerous right that most wandering preachers settled down after preaching for a few years, re-winning the Church's esteem by founding monasteries and nunneries. This was a two-sided sword, however. If a wandering preacher could be accused of heresy, so also could a heretic be considered as just another wandering preacher. Thus the early twelfth century must have been a time of great confusion in the ascetic life, as some controls were gradually placed on this phenomenon of wandering preachers.³

This is, of course, not a book about the Investiture Contest; but that conflict gave enormous impetus to the wayward monks I have been describing, and helped them to find a place in the hierarchy of the professional religious in society. It was not long before the pope, seeing the value of these wandering preachers, gave them public approbation and license for this work. The first known of these licensed monk-preachers was the monk Wedericus of St. Peter's in Ghent. He combined service of the papacy and moral preaching, using the permission that the pope had given him to spread the news of reform and convert people from their sins. He won over many, according to contemporary accounts. His converts even included a group of noble robbers, whom he convinced to give up their violent ways and found the monastery of Affligem in 1083.⁴ Gregory VII almost certainly commissioned other wandering preachers besides Wedericus, probably mostly monks. It was, as one annalist emphasized, an evil time, when both preaching and praying were more necessary than ever before, if the Christian people were to be gathered up for God.⁵ The story of Wedericus shows two phenomena

² Robert I. Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent* (London/New York, 1977), p. 62; Jeffrey B. Russell, *Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1965) for analysis. The story of Ramihrdus can be found in the *Chronicon s. Andreae castri Cameracensis*, MGH SS 7, (III.3): 540.

³ Moore; Herbert Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1961); Johannes von Walter, *Die Ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1903, 1906).

⁴ *Chronicon Affligemense*, MGH SS 9, (1): 407. For analysis, see Gérard G. Meersseman, "Eremitismo e predicazione itinerante dei secoli XI e XII," in *L'Eremitismo in occidente nei Secoli XI e XII*, Settimana Mendola 2 (1965), pp. 171-72. Dereine points out that Fulgentius, the first abbot of Affligem, had been driven from his home monastery of St. Vanne, Verdun, by pro-imperial monks. Charles Dereine, "La spiritualité 'apostolique' des premiers fondateurs d'Affligem (1083-1100)" *Rev. d'histoire ecclésiastique* 54 (1959): 63.

⁵ *Annales Blandiniensis*, MGH SS 5 [a. 1082], p. 29.

that would have a long history in the Church. First, the introduction and existence of papally blessed preachers gave others the courage to preach their own reforms, often at odds with official dogma, so preaching for reform can be seen as a great impetus to wandering preachers, many of whom over time were denounced as heretics.⁶ Wedericus also points the way to the new Church that emerged from the destructions of the Gregorian era: the papal license to preach superseded even the force of the Benedictine Rule. The pope was clearly the top of the hierarchy, deserving of absolute obedience on earth. Papal orders became both a command and an excuse, as other religious reformers, such as Bernard of Clairvaux in the twelfth century, understood very well.

When the dust of the eleventh century had settled, both the development of new monastic opportunities and rebuilding on the part of many monasteries had opened a window for change. One can see that the religious world of c. 1100 was very different from what it had been 150 years earlier. What difference did the lure of new monasteries make to Church and society? Certainly the new congregations brought with them the conviction that the Benedictine Rule need not be at the heart of every change, or at least that it was possible to clear out what they would have called the monastic rubbish that had adhered to it over the years.

What do we have as the Investiture Contest came to an end, and what was the result of this difficult century of wandering monks and resistance to change? The greatest novelty that came out of the efforts of monks to influence the world around them was the creation of new religious congregations. We have seen some congregations created in the eleventh century, responding to the needs and longings of founders for a more active life in the world, as they understood their scriptural duty. This trickle of new foundations became a flood in the early twelfth century, now that monks or would-be monks had clear choices, thanks to the definitions made in the polemics of the eleventh century. Many new interpretations of the Benedictine Rule won proponents,⁷ as well as groups claiming to go back to the bare original of the Rule, such as the Cistercians. Other groups, while

⁶ A particularly exciting case is that of Henry of Lausanne, who took over the city of Le Mans in the bishop's absence, turning the people to such violent anticlericalism that all the priests fled the town. See Moore, pp. 83–90.

⁷ See for example the case of Afflighem. In the early years after its foundation in 1083 the monks placed a central emphasis on both hospitality, a typical Benedictine

remaining Benedictine, assumed a much greater influence from the early hermits and even from recluses, such as the Carthusians.⁸ Old-fashioned, mainstream Benedictine monasticism, following the same route of Rule and tradition it had for centuries, remained as a popular option.

The magnitude of the revolution was perhaps most obvious in the realization that something besides the Benedictine Rule could regulate the behavior of those who wished for a permanent religious life, and that even so great an authority as the Benedictine Rule was no longer appropriate to the diversity within the ascetic religious community. Tangled throughout the story of polemic and defense is the story of a radically revisionist order, that of the canons regular. While the common life of the clergy had been an early goal of the Church, and canonries had existed for centuries, the canons regular of the eleventh century became a viable alternative to Benedictine monasticism. The canonry included ascetic features, so its members could claim a holy commission, but did not include flight from the world. Instead, canons regular quickly and openly turned to care of the world as their *raison d'être*. It is impossible to know how many monks abandoned the cloister for the canonry, although legislation and treatises against such transfers in the twelfth century suggest it was common.⁹ It is also impossible to tell how many men who might have become monks turned instead to the life of the canon regular as a legitimate outlet for a desire to serve in the world, without the weight of criticism faced by Benedictines.¹⁰ Thus the turn toward service in

virtue, and protection of travellers, an innovation that may have influenced the development of the military religious orders. See Dereine, "La spiritualité," p. 52.

⁸ Guiges I, *Coutumes de Chartreuse*, SC 313 provides an excellent introduction to the attitudes of the early Carthusians. A particularly interesting fusion of monk and hermit was the congregation of Grandmont that, while not going out into the world, placed a strong emphasis on teaching by example. See Carole Hutchison, *The Hermit Monks of Grandmont* (Kalamazoo, 1989), *passim*.

⁹ This is another case that suggests how close canons regular and monks were perceived to be to each other, since the issue of transfers to stricter communities, and arguments over which community was indeed stricter, was also a central issue of acrimonious debate between various congregations of monks in the twelfth century. An early example for canons and monks is a case from the pontificate of Urban II in which the pope forbade the transfer of St. Ruf canons to a "stricter life" (*vita arctior*). Cited in Karl Bosl, *Regularkanoniker (Augustinerchorherren) und Seelsorge in Kirche und Gesellschaft des europäischen 12. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1979), p. 69.

¹⁰ A main issue in the twelfth century remained the varying relationship of monks of the various congregations and canons toward the world. This is most easily summed up in the question: "can monks preach?" See Giovanni Lunardi, *L'ideale monastico*

the world gave birth to the first of a variety of organizations that could carry on such work with greater authority and safety.

The old-style, traditional Benedictine culture was the winner in the contest against the element in its midst that was trying to reinterpret the Benedictine mission as one that included a significant element of physical care of and contact with the laity by the non-office-holding monk. It had too much weight of tradition on its side, while the proponents of involvement in the world lacked enough fanatics and martyrs to baulk at the force of public opinion. Benedictines, by now clearly defined for their moderate stance on contact with the world and general avoidance of worldly matters in favor of liturgical prayer, continued to exist robustly as one option in the midst of a spate of new, "reformed" foundations, whose founders *did* want to change these traditions. It was largely left to these new congregations to carry on in a more open way the mission to the world.

By the pontificate of Urban II (1088–1099) Benedictine monks were being placed back into the role they had played for centuries. The Benedictine communities that had been most involved in the mission to the world, Vallombrosa and Hirsau, were even careful to rewrite their own history to play down their role in the exciting events of the greater ecclesiastical reform movement, leaving a track that has been hard to follow. This reluctant pullback to a more "Benedictine" form of life is particularly obvious for the Vallombrosans. Beginning probably in 1088, the Vallombrosans began yet another conflict with a bishop, this time Daibertus of Pisa, who was suspected of simony. Pope Urban II decided in favor of Daibertus, but the Vallombrosans refused to accept his decision, a stand also adopted by the Camaldolesi. Urban had to call them sharply to order. Soon after that he had to dampen their ardor for action yet again; he specifically forbade Vallombrosan monks to take part in the First Crusade without the permission of their abbot or diocesan bishop.¹¹ Plainly the Vallombrosans were still showing definite signs of independence unacceptable

nelle polemiche del secolo XII sulla vita religiosa (Noci, 1970); a recent short analysis of the issues involved can be found in John H. Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz* (Berkeley, 1983), pp. 60–69.

¹¹ Werner Goetz, "Reformpapsttum, Adel und monastische Erneuerung in der Toscana," in *Investiturstreit und Reichsverfassung*, Josef Fleckenstein, ed. (Sigmaringen, 1973), p. 239; Sofia Boesch Gajano, "Storia e tradizione Vallombrosane" *Bullettino dell'istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo* 76 (1964): 118.

in a post-Gregorian religious world. Urban also explicitly condemned all extra-claustral activities of this troublesome congregation, urging in a letter of 1091 that they occupy themselves with divine services.¹² As the social situation calmed toward the year 1100, and the papacy became more of a force with which monks had to reckon, the Vallombrosans were gradually forced away from their active and interfering position in the world. Pope Urban did his part by acting vigorously against instability among monks, and indeed, anyone whose wandering could keep the fires of controversy burning.¹³

By the twelfth century monks, that is old-style *Benedictine* monks, had many new competitors as western Europe's experts in Christianity. Yet the controversy had proved the lasting value of Benedictine life to medieval society. In the battle to reinterpret the monastic values system, the conservatives won. A Benedictine monk should not be active in the affairs of secular society; instead he is defined by withdrawal and stability, but at the same time continues to play an economic role that includes some engagement in the world. Those who in earlier generations would have been Benedictines, trying to accommodate action in the world with monastic expectations, had now been given other religious options that had been defined by this controversy. Similarly, those who wanted even less to do with the world had their own legitimized and separate outlets. "Benedictine" had come to signify a middle path, rejecting complete isolation from the cares of the world, yet refusing to embrace action in the world as a natural part of the religious life.

Nevertheless, Benedictine monasticism itself did not emerge completely unchanged from this long experiment with the world. Groups and individuals had to make conscious decisions about which path to follow, ranging from the turn of canons regular to pastoral care, to Cistercians who claimed to act only in obedience to the pope, to the Carthusians and other groups who tried to turn their backs on the world as completely as possible. I believe that by the end of the eleventh century all groups, including the traditional Benedictines, agreed that simple stability was not enough to claim holiness of life. As we have seen, they turned to the question of the individual's

¹² Gajano, p. 133.

¹³ Cinzio Violante, "Il monachesimo cluniacense di fronte al mondo politico ed ecclesiastico. Secoli X e XI," in Violante, *Studi sulla cristianità medioevale* (Milan, 1972), p. 50.

intention well before Peter Abelard made it a subject for debate in the schools of Paris.¹⁴

In a world of so much change and disaster, a sense of interiority, a "solitude of heart" was more important than physical isolation. Thanks to the debates in the eleventh century, intentionality regained the place it had held in early monasticism as an important expression in the ideology of the holy life. It is best expressed in Hugh of Fouilloy's tract *De claustro animae*, "On the Cloister of the Soul," that appeared in the middle years of the twelfth century. This work is a broad and sweeping defense of the right and ability of the holy man, *any* holy man, to lead a life in the world. The central argument is that any ascetic, monk or cleric, deals with two cloisters: an exterior one made of brick or stone, and an interior one of thoughts and commitment. Hugh of Fouilloy recognizes that there are great dangers outside of a physical cloister, but argues that the inner man, if he has kept to the cloister of his mind, can save even an indiscreet and lazy outer man.¹⁵ Even when the ascetic goes bodily from place to place, his mind can remain firmly within this "interior cloister" of contemplation. As long as he concentrates on heaven, he is separated from the evil influence of earthly things.¹⁶

The person with pretensions to the holy life should still hold the world in contempt, but that is no reason for him to avoid going out into the world to help his neighbor.¹⁷ Hugh is firmly convinced that professional religious are better than the laypeople who surround them, but that fact only makes their duty to help others more pressing. He is especially fond of comparing his fellows to the prophet Samuel, who lived in the temple, but went out to teach, condescending with compassion to those who needed him.¹⁸ They should be careful, since the walls between them and temptation are more fragile outside of the physical safety of a monastery. But, as Hugh reminds his readers, nothing will separate them from the love of Christ; all they need is brotherly love, *caritas*, to have success.¹⁹

¹⁴ It must not be forgotten that the gradual adoption of the culture of the schools even by Benedictines and congregations yet more withdrawn from the world had an immense influence on the shape of all professional religious life.

¹⁵ Hugo de Folieto, *De claustro animae libri quatuor*, PL 176, (I.1): 1021.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, (III.1): 1087.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, (III.2): 1088.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, (III.5): 1092, (III.9): 1106–1107.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, (I.2): 1023.

De claustro animae contains almost all of the elements of the desire for involvement in the world that we have examined. But, nonetheless, it provides a firm statement that the world-oriented monks lost at least part of their battle, at least within the Benedictine tradition. For Hugh of Fouillooy was not a Benedictine monk, but a regular canon.²⁰ Like many other men of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, he was unable to fulfill his goal of service to the world from within the Benedictine world, and entered upon a new religious path. The central intent of his treatise appears to have been to defend the activities of canons regular against the proponents of old-style, stable monasticism who criticized them.

Most important for religious change in western Europe, new authorities came to compete with the monopoly of the Benedictine Rule. Besides Augustine's Rule, the most important new source was the New Testament itself, as wayward monks and members of new congregations learned to apply the lessons of both the gospels and epistles to themselves, rather than to the realm of theory. The most outstanding example of this is in the hagiography of the wandering preachers of northern France from the early twelfth century, as I have already mentioned in the Introduction. Bernard of Tiron was one of the most successful of these preachers. It is worth recalling to the readers' attention his defense, that he was following the apostle Paul's command: "be my follower as I am Christ's" (1 Cor 11.1). He went on to declare that he was better as a preacher than a member of the secular clergy would be, because he set such a good example.²¹ It was a blending of the old and new. New authorities were cited for a new level of activity in the world. Still, spiritual ascendancy had only been gained in the first place by a life of asceticism and withdrawal from the world, a lesson that the active monks of the tenth and eleventh centuries had learned.

It took centuries for the Benedictines, as we can now call them, to lose their place in popular esteem. They were the proponents of old values, including the great value of withdrawal and asceticism, and still had their charm for much of the population. As Van Engen has pointed out, donations, that clear mark of public approval, contin-

²⁰ For information on Hugh of Fouillooy, see Henri Peltier, "Hugues de Fouillooy chanoine regulier, prieur de Saint-Laurent-au-Bois" *Revue du moyen âge latin* 2 (1946): 25-44; Reginald Grégoire, "Le *De claustro animae* est-il d'un Clunisien?" *StMon* 4 (1962): 193-96.

²¹ See above, introduction.

ued to roll into Benedictine coffers throughout the twelfth century and beyond.²² However, in the realms of religion and theology, the Benedictines were no longer the new, the exciting, as they had been in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Their stability had served them well for centuries, as ascetic detachment from the world gave them the power to intervene in a circle of contemplation and action, as it did more explicitly with some of the new monastic houses. They were forced to the defensive in the debates on the religious life in the twelfth century, as a *vita apostolica* that included care of the rest of humanity was hailed as the truest reflection of the spirit of the age, and other monasteries and canonries were able to adapt or create themselves for the needs of the time.²³ It was even plausible for Pope Innocent II to say that "the canonical life is the apostolic life," and that the way of the canons regular was higher than that of monks since it was based on *carietas*.²⁴ In their obedience to the Benedictine Rule and the weight of tradition that surrounded it, Benedictines closed themselves out of a great movement to teach Christianity in this world, a movement that they themselves had created.

²² John Van Engen, "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150" *Speculum* 61/2 (1986): 269–304.

²³ See Johannes Laudage, *Priesterbild und Reformpapsttum im 11. Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 1984), p. 105.

²⁴ Cited in Bosl, p. 31.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- Abbo Floriacensis. *Apologeticus ad Hugonem et Rodbertum reges Francorum*. PL 139: 461–72.
- . *Collectio canonum*. PL 139: 471–508.
- Adalbéron de Laon. *Poème au Roi Robert*. Edited by Claude Carozzi. Paris: Société d'édition "Les belles lettres," 1979.
- Adalgerus. *Admonitio ad Nonsuindam reclusam seu Liber virtutum*. PL 134: 915–38.
- Adam of Bremen. *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*. Edited and translated by Francis J. Tschan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Ademarus. *Historiarum libri III*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 106–48.
- Adrevaldus, Aimoinus, et al. *Les miracles de saint-Benoît*. Edited by E. de Certain. Paris: Jules Renouard, 1858.
- Aelred of Rievaulx. *La Vie de Recluse*. Edited by Charles Dumont. SC 76 (1961).
- [Aethelwold?]. *Regularis concordia Angliae nationis monachorum sanctimonialiumque*. Edited and translated by Dom Thomas Symons. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1953.
- Aimo Floriacensis. *Vita sancti Abbonis*. PL 139: 387–414.
- Alpertus de s. Symphorian. *De diversitate temporum libri II*. MGH SS 4: 700–23.
- The Ancrene Riwele*. Translated by M.B. Salu. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1990.
- Andreas abbas Strumensi. *Vita sancti Arialldi*. Edited by F. Baethgen. MGH SS 30,2: 1047–75.
- . *Vita Iohannis Gualberti*. Edited by F. Baethgen. MGH SS 30,2: 1080–1104.
- Annales Augustani*. MGH SS 3: 123–36.
- Annales Blandiniensis*. Edited by Ludowicus Bethmann. MGH SS 5: 20–34. Also in *Les Annales de Saint-Pierre de Gand et de Saint-Amand*. Edited by Philip Grierson. Brussels: Palais de Académies, 1937.
- Annales Einsidlenses*. MGH SS 3: 137–49.
- Annales Hildesheimenses*. MGH SS rer. Germ. in usum scholarum, 1878 (reprint ed. 1947).
- Annales Lamberti*. MGH SS 3: 18–69, 90–103.
- Annales Ottenburani*. MGH SS 5: 1–9.
- Annales Posonienses*. Edited by Emericus Madzsar. SS rer. Hung. 1: 119–27.
- Annales Pragenses*. MGH SS 3: 119–21.
- Annales Quedlinburgenses*. MGH SS 3: 22–90.
- Annales s. Bavonis Gandensis*. MGH SS 2: 185–91.
- Annales s. Benigni Divionensis*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 5: 37–50.
- Annalista Saxo*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 6: 542–777.
- Arnoldus de s. Emmerammo. *Ex libris de s. Emmerammo duo*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 543–74.
- Atto. *Vita s. Joannis Gualberti*. PL 146: 667–706.
- Baldricus. *Vita b. Roberti de Arbrissello*. PL 162: 1043–58.
- Basil. *Ascetical Works*. Translated by M. Monica Wagner. The Fathers of the Church 9. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1962.
- Bede. *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*, in *Baedae Opera Historica*. Edited by Carolus Plummer. Oxford: Clarendon, 1896.
- Beno aliique cardinales schismatices. *Contra Gregorium VII. et Urbanum II. scripta*. Edited by Kuno Francke. MGH LL 2: 366–422.

- Bernard of Clairvaux. *Apologia*. In Conrad Rudolph, *The "Things of Greater Importance": Bernard of Clairvaux' Apologia and the Medieval Attitude toward Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990, pp. 232–87.
- Bernoldus. *Chronicon*. MGH SS 5: 385–467.
- Bertarius. *Gesta episcoporum Virdunensium auctoribus Bertario et anonymo monachis s. Vitoni*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 36–51.
- Bertholdus. *Annales*. MGH SS 5: 264–326.
- Bonizo episcopus Sutrinus. *Liber ad amicum*. Edited by Ernst Dümmler. MGH LL 1: 568–620.
- Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV*. Edited by Carl Erdmann and Norbert Fickermann. MGH Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5. Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1950 (reprint ed. Munich: MGH, 1981).
- Bruno Querfurtensis. *S. Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris vita altera*. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH series nova, 4,2 (1969).
- . *Vita quinque fratrum eremitarum seu Vita vel passio Benedicti et Johannis sociorumque suorum*. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH series nova, 4,3 (1973).
- Burchardus Wormaciensis. *Decretorum libri XX*. PL 140: 537–1058.
- Candidus. *Vita Eigilis abbatis Fuldensis*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 15,1: 221–33.
- Carmen Laureshamense*. In *Codex Laureshamensis*, vol. 1. Edited by Karl Glöckner. Darmstadt: Verlag des historischen Vereins für Hessen, 1929.
- Carmine Cantabrigiensia*. Edited by Karl Strecker. MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol. Berlin: Weidmann, 1966.
- Cassian, John. *The Conferences*. Translated by Edgar C.S. Gibson, pp. 293–545. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. 2nd Series, vol. 11. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. (reprint ed. 1978). SC vols. 42, 54, 64, edited by E. Pichery (1955–1959).
- . *The Institutes*. Translated by Edgar C.S. Gibson, pp. 183–290. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. 2nd series, vol. 11. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. (reprint ed. 1978). SC 109, edited by Jean-Claude Guy (1965).
- Casus sancti Galli*. Edited by D. Ildephonsus ab Arx. MGH SS 2: 59–183.
- Chronicon Affligemense*. MGH SS 9: 407–17.
- Chronicon Hujesburgense*. Edited by Ottokar Menzel. *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 52 (1934): 130–45.
- Chronicon Laureshamense*. Edited by K. Pertz. MGH SS 21: 334–453.
- Chronicon s. Andreae castri Cameracesii*. Edited by L.C. Bethmann. MGH SS 7: 526–50.
- Chronicon s. Michaelis in pago Virdunensi*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 78–86.
- Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris regni Bohemiae*. Vol. 1. Edited by Gustavus Friedrich. Prague: Sumptibus Comitiorum Regni Bohemiae, 1904–1907.
- Columbanus. *Sancti Columbani opera*. Edited by George S.M. Walker. *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 2. Dublin: Institute for Advanced Studies, 1957.
- Conradus. *Vita Wolfhelmi abbatis Brunwilerensis*. Edited by Rogerus Wilmans. MGH SS 12: 180–95.
- Constantinus abbas. *Vita Adalberonis II. Mettensis episcopi*. MGH SS 4: 658–72.
- Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores*. Edited by Anselmus Davril and Linus Donnat. CCM 7,3: 3–60.
- Consuetudines Germaniae: Redactio Fuldensis-Trevirensis (F)*. Edited by Maria Wegener and Candida Elvert. CCM 7,3: 257–322.
- Consuetudines Germaniae: Redactio Sancti Emmerammi, dicta Einsidlensis (E)*. Edited by Maria Wegener and Candida Elvert. CCM 7,3: 323–73.
- Cosmas Pragensis. *Chronica Boemorum*. Edited by Bertold Bretholz. MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 2.
- Donizo. *Vita Mathildis*. MGH SS 12: 348–409.
- Eberwinus. *Vita s. Symeonis*. AASS Iun. I: 85–92.

- Ekkebertus. *Vita sancti Haimeradi*. Edited by Rudolfus Koepke. MGH SS 10: 595–607.
- Ekkehard IV. *Rhythmi de sancti Otmar*. MGH SS 2: 54–58.
- Eucherius episcopus Lugdunensis. *De laude eremi*. PL 50: 701–12.
- Everhelmus. *Vita Popponis abbatis Stabulensis*. MGH SS 11: 291–316.
- Folcuinus. *Gesta abbatum s. Bertini Sithiensium*. Edited by O. Holder-Egger. MGH SS 13: 600–35.
- Fulbert of Chartres. *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*. Edited and translated by Frederick Behrends. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Gaufridus Grossus. *Vita b. Bernardi Tironiensis*. PL 172: 1363–1446.
- Gerhardus. *Vita sancti Oudalrici episcopi*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 377–425.
- Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium*. MGH SS 2: 270–301.
- Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium*. Edited by L.C. Bethmann. MGH SS 7: 393–525.
- Gregory I. *Dialogues*. Book II: *Saint Benedict*. Translated by Myra L. Uhlfelder. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.
- . *Pastoral Care*. Translated by Henry Davis. Ancient Christian Writers Vol. 11. New York: Newman Press, 1950. SC 381–82, edited by Bruno Judic and Floribert Rommel (1992).
- . *Registrum*. Edited by Paul Ewald and Ludwig Hartmann. MGH Epist. 1.
- Gregory VII. *Registrum*. Edited by Erich Caspar. MGH Epist. 2.
- Gregory of Tours. *The History of the Franks*. Edited and translated by Lewis Thorpe. Penguin Books, 1974.
- . *Liber de gloria confessorum*. PL 71: 829–910.
- Grimlaicus. *Regula solitariorum*. PL 103: 573–664.
- Guiges I. *Coutumes de Chartreuse*. SC 313 (1984).
- Gumpoldus. *Vita Vencezlavi ducis Bohemiae*. MGH SS 4: 211–23.
- Haimo. *Vita Willihelmi abbatis Hirsauensis*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 12: 209–25.
- Hartmannus monachus s. Galli. *Vita I Wiboradae*. AASS Mai II: 289–98.
- The Heliand: the Saxon Gospel*. Translated with commentary by G. Ronald Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Helmold, priest of Bosau. *The Chronicle of the Slavs*. Translated by Francis J. Tschan. New York: Columbia University Press, 1935.
- Herimannus Augiensis. *Chronicon*. MGH SS 5: 67–133.
- Hieronymus, Eusebius. *Epistolae*. Edited by Isidorus Hilberg. CSEL 54 (1910).
- Hildemar. *Expositio Regulae*. Edited by Rupert Mittermüller. In Gregorius I. *Vita et Regula SS. P. Benedicti una cum Expositione Regulae*. Vol. 3: *Expositio Regulae ab Hildemaro tradita et nunc primum typis mandata*. Regensburg: S. Sedis Apostolicae Typographi, 1880.
- Hincmarus archiepiscopus Rhemensis. “Zwei Schriften des Erzbischofs Hinkmar von Reims.” Wilhelm Gundlach, ed., *ZKG* 10 (1889): 258–310.
- Historia Hirsauensis monasterii*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 14: 254–65.
- Hrabanus (Maurus) abbas Fuldensis et archiepiscopus Moguntiacensis. *Liber de oblatione puerorum*. PL 107: 419–40.
- Hrotsvitha. *Hrotsvithae opera*. Edited by H. Homeyer. Munich: Verlag Ferdinand Schöningh, 1970.
- Hugo abbas Farfensis. *Destructio monasterii Farfensis 890–997*. Edited by L.C. Bethmann. MGH SS 11: 530–39.
- Hugo de Folieto. *De clauistro animae libri quatuor*. PL 176: 1017–1184.
- Hugo monachus Virdunensis et Divionensis, abbas Flaviniacensis. *Chronicon*. Edited by K. Pertz. MGH SS 8: 280–503.
- Humbertus, *Libri III adversus simoniacos*. MGH LL 1: 95–253.
- Iohannes abbas s. Arnulfi. *Vita Iohannis abbatis Gorziensis*. MGH SS 4: 335–77.
- Johannes Gorziensis. *Miracula s. Gorgonii*. MGH SS 4: 239–47.
- John of Salerno. *The Life of St. Odo of Cluny*. In *St. Odo of Cluny*. Edited and translated by Gerard Sitwell, pp. 3–87. London: Sheed & Ward, 1958.

- Lampertus monachus Hersfeldensis. *Annales*. Edited by Oswald Holder-Egger. MGH SS rer. Germ. in usum scholarum, vol. 28 (1894).
- Lanfranc. *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*. Edited by David Knowles. New York: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Legenda ss. Zoerardi et Benedicti*. Edited by Emericus Madzsar. SS rer. Hung. 2: 347–61.
- Liber de unitate ecclesiae conservanda*. Edited by W. Schwenkenbecher. MGH LL 2: 173–284.
- Liber tramitis aevi Odilonis abbatis*. Edited by Petrus Dinter. CCM 10 (1980).
- Liudger. *Vita Gregorii abbatis Traiectensis*. Edited by O. Holder-Egger. MGH SS 15,1: 63–79.
- Manegoldus. *Ad Gebhardum liber*. Edited by Kuno Francke. MGH LL 1: 300–430.
- Marianus Scottus. *Chronicon*. Edited by G. Waitz and P. Kilon. MGH SS 5: 481–568.
- Necrologia Germaniae*. Edited by Franciscus Baumann. MGH Necrologiae 1.
- Notker der Deutsche. *Der Psalter. Psalm 1–50*. Edited by Petrus W. Tax. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1979.
- Odilo abbas Cluniacensis. "Ein Schreiben Odilos von Cluni [sic] an Heinrich III. vom October 1046," edited by Ernst Sackur. *Neues Archiv* 24 (1899): 728–35.
- Odo abbas Cluniacensis. *Collationes*. PL 133: 517–638.
- . *The Life of St. Gerald of Aurillac*. In *St. Odo of Cluny*. Edited and translated by Gerard Sitwell, pp. 89–180. London: Sheed & Ward, 1958.
- . *Occupatio*. Edited by Antonius Swoboda. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1900.
- . *Sermones quinque*. PL 133: 709–52.
- Ordo inclusorum*. In *Bavaria sancta*. Edited by Mattias Raderus, 3: 115–16. Munich, 1627.
- Othloh monachus s. Emmerammi. *Libellus de suis tentationibus, varia fortuna et scriptis*. PL 146: 23–58.
- . *Liber de admonitione clericorum et laicorum*. PL 146: 243–62.
- . *Liber visionum*. Edited by Paul Gerhard Schmidt. MGH Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters, vol. 13 (1989).
- . *Vita s. Wolfkangi episcopi*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 521–42.
- Pachasius Radbertus. *De corpore et sanguine Domini*. CCCM 16 (1963).
- Passio s. Cholomanni*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 674–77.
- Paulus Bernriedensi. *Vita b. Herlucae*. AASS Apr. II: 549–54.
- Petrus Crassus. *Defensio Heinrici IV. regis*. Edited by L. von Heinemann. MGH LL 1: 432–53.
- Petrus Damiani. *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*. Edited by Kurt Reindel. 4 vols. (MGH Briefe).
- . *Letters*. Translated by Owen Blum. The Fathers of the Church, Mediaeval Continuation. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1990.
- . *Vita beati Romualdi*. Edited by Giovanni Tabacco. Fonti per la storia d'Italia 94. Rome: Nella sede dell'istituto palazzo Borromini, 1957.
- Petrus Venerabilis. *The Letters of Peter the Venerable*. Edited by Giles Constable. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Purchardus. *Carmen de gestis Witigowonis abbatis*. MGH SS 4: 621–32.
- Rangerius. *Vita metrica s. Anselmi Lucensis episcopi*. Edited by E. Sackur, et al. MGH SS 30,2: 1152–1307.
- Ratherius Veronensis. "De translatione s. Metronis." In *Opera minora*. Edited by Peter Reid. CCCM 46 (1976), pp. 11–29.
- . *Die Briefe des Bischofs Rather von Verona*. Edited by Fritz Weigle. MGH Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 1.
- . *Excerptum ex Dialogo Confessionali cujusdam sceleratissimi, mirum dictu*. PL 136: 391–444.

- . *Praeloquiorum libri VI*. Edited by Peter Reid. CCCM 46A (1984).
- . *Sermo XI*. PL 136: 749–758.
- Ratramnus of Corvey. *De corpore et sanguine Domini*. PL 121: 103–71.
- Regino abbas Prumiensis. *Chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi*. MGH SS rer. Germ. in usum scholarum.
- Reimannus, sive Ousmannus. *Vita Cadroe abbate*. AASS Mart. I: 468–80.
- Rhythmi de sancto Otmaro*. MGH SS 2: 54–58.
- Rimbertus. *Vita Anskarii*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS rer. Germ. in us. schol.
- Rodulfus Glaber. *Opera*. Edited by John France and Neithard Bulst. Translated by John France and Paul Reynolds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Ruotger. *Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis*. Edited by Irene Ott. MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 10.
- The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*. Translated by Benedicta Ward. Kalamazoo, Cistercian Publications, 1975.
- Sigebertus Gemblacensis. *Chronica*. Edited by Ludwig Bethmann. MGH SS 6: 268–374.
- . *Vita Wicberti*. MGH SS 8: 504–16.
- Smaragdus abbas s. Michaelis. *Diadema monachorum*. PL 102: 593–690.
- . *Expositio in regulam s. Benedicti*. Edited by Alfred Spannagel and Pius Engelbert. CCM 8 (1974).
- Statuta Murbacensia (816)*. In *Legislatio Aquisgranensis*. Edited by Josef Semmler. CCM, vol. 1, pp. 437–50.
- Stephanus II. *Epistolae et Decreta*. PL 89: 993–1030.
- Syrus. *Vita Majoli abbatis Cluniacensis*. AASS Mai II: 667–83.
- Die Tegenseer Briefsammlung (Froumund)*. Edited by Karl Strecker. MGH Epist. Selectae 3.
- Thietmar Merseburgensis episcopus. *Chronicon*. Edited by Robert Holtzmann. MGH SS rer. Germ. nova series 9.
- Translationis et inventionis sancti Dionysii Ratisponensis historia antiquior*. Edited by A. Hofmeister. MGH SS 30,2: 823–37.
- Vulcudus. *Vita Bardonis archiepiscopi Moguntini*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 11: 317–21.
- Wenricus scolasticus Trevirensis. *Epistola sub Theoderici episcopi Viridunensis nomine composita*. Edited by Kuno Francke. MGH LL 1: 280–99.
- Wido episcopus Ferrariensis. *De scismate Hildebrandi*. Edited by Roger Wilmans. MGH LL 1: 529–67.
- Wido monachus. *Widonis monachi epistola ad Heribertum archiepiscopum*. Edited by Friedrich Thaner. MGH LL 1: 1–7.
- Wilhelmus Hirsaugiensis. *Constitutiones Hirsaugienses*. PL 150: 923–1146.
- Willelmus Clusensis. *Vita Benedicti abbatis Clusensis*. Edited by Ludovicus Bethmann. MGH SS 12: 196–208.
- Wipo. *Proverbia*. MGH SS 11: 245–47.
- Woltherius. *Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildenesheimensis posterior*. Edited by K. Pertz. MGH SS 11: 196–218.
- . *Vita Godehardi episcopi Hildenesheimensis prior*. MGH SS 11: 162–96.
- Anonymous vitae are arranged by the name of the saint*
- Vita sancti Abrahae eremitaе*. PL 73: 281–92; 651–60.
- S. Adalberti Pragensis episcopi et martyris vita prior. Edited by Jadwiga Karwasińska. MPH series nova, 4,1 (1962).
- Vita Annonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis*. Edited by Rudolf Koepke. MGH SS 11: 462–518.
- Vita s. Arduini confessoris*. AASS Aug. III: 214–21.
- Vita Bardonis maior*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 11: 321–42.

- Vita et miracula sancti Bononii abbatis Locediensis*. Edited by Gerhardus Schwartz and Adolfus Hofmeister. MGH SS 30,2: 1023–33.
- Vita et passio sancti Brunonis episcopi et martyris Querfordensis*. Edited by Heinrich Kauffmann. MGH SS 30,2: 1350–67.
- Vita Burchardi episcopi Wormatiensis*. Edited by G. Waitz. MGH SS 4: 829–46.
- Vita Drogonis*. AASS Apr. II: 443–45.
- Vita Findani*. MGH SS 15,1: 502–506.
- Vita Guntheri eremita*. Edited by K. Pertz. MGH SS 11: 276–79.
- Vita s. Hugonis monachi Aeduensi et priore Enziacensi*. AASS Apr. II: 761–70.
- Vita Iohannis Gualberti auctore discipulo eius anonymo*. MGH SS 30,2: 1104–10.
- Vita Kaddroe abbatis Walciodorensis*. Edited by L. de Heinemann. MGH SS 15,2: 689–92.
- Das Leben der Liutbirg*. Edited by Ottokar Menzel. MGH Deutsches Mittelalter 3.
- Vita Mahtildis reginae antiquior*. Edited by Rudolf Koepke. MGH SS 10: 573–82.
- Vita s. Meginrati*. Edited by O. Holder-Egger. MGH SS 15,1: 444–48.
- Vita bb. Salomes et Judith*. AASS Iun. VII: 451–56.
- Vita maior Stephani regis Ungariae*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 11: 229–42.
- Vita Theoderici abbatis Andaginensis*. Edited by W. Wattenbach. MGH SS 12: 36–57.
- Vita Theogeri abbatis s. Georgii et episcopi Mettensis*. Edited by Philippus Jaffé. MGH SS 12: 449–79.
- Vita et passio sancti Wenceslai et sancte Ludmille avie eius*. In Pekař, Josef. *Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden und die Echtheit Christians*. Prague: Alois Wiesner, 1906.

Secondary Literature

- A Cluny. Congrès scientifique. Dijon: Bernigaud & Privat, 1950.
- Adamski, H.J. *Christussäule im Dom zu Hildesheim*. Hildesheim: Bernard Verlag, 1979.
- Althoff, Gerd and Hagen Keller. *Heinrich I. und Otto der Große: Neubeginn und karolingisches Erbe*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Muster-Schmidt Verlag, 1985.
- Angenendt, Arnold. "Die irische Peregrinatio und ihre Auswirkungen auf dem Kontinent vor dem Jahre 800." In Löwe, 1: 52–79.
- . *Monachi Peregrini. Studien zu Pirmin und den monastischen Vorstellungen des frühen Mittelalters*. Münstersche Mittelalterschriften 6. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972.
- Baker, Derek. "Crossroads and Crises in the Religious Life of the Later Eleventh Century." In Baker, Derek, ed. *The Church in Town and Countryside*, pp. 137–48. Studies in Church History 16. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.
- Basedow, Armin. *Die Inklusen in Deutschland vornehmlich in der Gegend des Niederrheins um die Wende des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts*. Heidelberg: Verlag von J. Hörning, 1895.
- Bates, David. *Normandy before 1066*. London: Longman, 1982.
- Bauerreiß, Romuald. "St. Georgen im Schwarzwald, ein Reformmittelpunkt Südostdeutschlands im beginnenden 12. Jahrhundert." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 51 (1933): 196–201; 52 (1934): 47–56.
- Bechthum, Martin. *Beweggründe und Bedeutung des Vagantentums in der Lateinischen Kirche des Mittelalters*. Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen, neueren und allgemeinen Geschichte 14. Jena: Verlag von Gustav Fischer, 1941.
- Benz, Karl J. "Heinrich II. und Cluny." *Rev. ben.* 84 (1974): 313–37.
- Berlière, Ursmer. "L'exercice du ministère paroissial par les moines dans le haut moyen-âge." *Rev. ben.* 39 (1927): 227–50.
- Bernhardt, John W. *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany, c. 936–1075*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . "Servitium regis and Monastic Property in Early Medieval Germany." *Viator* 18 (1987): 53–88.
- Beumann, Helmut, ed. *Heidenmission und Kreuzzugsgedanke in der deutschen Ostpolitik des Mittelalters*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.

- Bienvenu, Jean-Marc. "Aux origines d'un ordre religieux: Robert d'Arbrissel et la fondation de Fontevraud (1101)." *Cahiers d'histoire* 20 (1975): 227-51.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. "Literarisches und künstlerisches Leben in St. Emmeram (Regensburg) während des frühen und hohen Mittelalters." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 51 (1933): 102-42.
- Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. *The Investiture Controversy*. Translation by author. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Boeckler, Albert. *Ikongraphische Studien zu den Wunderszenen in der ottonischen Malerei der Reichenau*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1961.
- Boesch, Sofia. "Giovanni Gualberto e la vita comune del clero nelle biografie di Andrea da Strumi e di Atto da Vallombrosa." In *La vita comune del clero*, 2: 228-35.
- Bogyay, Thomas von. "Adalbert von Prag und die Ungarn—ein Problem der Quellen-Interpretation." *Ungarn-Jb* 7 (1976): 9-36.
- . *Stephanus Rex. Versuch einer Biographie*. Vienna/Munich: Verlag Herold, 1975.
- , ed. *Ungarns Geschichtsschreiber*. Vol. 1: *Die heiligen Könige*. Graz: Verlag Styria, 1976.
- Borovi, Josef. "Parallele zwischen der böhmisch-polnischen und der ungarischen Kirchenorganisation." In Zagiba, ed. *Millenium Dioeceseos Pragensis*, pp. 50-63.
- Bosl, Karl. "Adalbert von Prag—Heiliger an einer europäischen Zeitwende." In Glassl, Horst, and Otfried Pustejovsky, eds. *Ein Leben—drei Epochen*. FS für Hans Schütz zum 70. Geburtstag, pp. 107-21. Munich: Ackermann-Gemeinde, 1971. (Reprinted in Bosl, *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn*, pp. 125-36.)
- . *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn. Gesellschaft, Politik und Kultur in Mitteleuropa*. Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 32. Munich/Vienna: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1976.
- . "Herzog, König und Bischof im 10. Jahrhundert." In Bosl, *Böhmen und seine Nachbarn*, pp. 88-124. (Reprinted in Seibt, ed., pp. 269-94.)
- . "Das Kloster San Alessio auf dem Aventin zu Rom." In *Beiträge zu Südosteuropa-Forschung*, 2: 15-28. Munich: Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1970.
- . *Regularkanoniker (Augustinerchorherren) und Seelsorge in Kirche und Gesellschaft des europäischen 12. Jahrhunderts*. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse NF 86. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1979.
- Brackmann, Albert. "Gregor VII und die kirchliche Reformbewegung in Deutschland." *StGreg* 2 (1947): 7-30.
- Brezzi, Paulo. "Fuga dal mondo e conquista cristiana del mondo nella riforma gregoriana." In *Chiesa e riforma*, pp. 9-35.
- Brown, Peter. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." In *Society and the Holy in Late Antiquity*, pp. 103-52. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Briske, Wolfgang. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Lutizenbundes. Deutsch-wendische Beziehungen des 10.-12. Jahrhunderts*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 3. Münster/Cologne: Böhlau-Verlag, 1955.
- Büttner, Heinrich. "Abt Wilhelm von Hirsau und die Entwicklung der Rechtsstellung der Reformklöster im 11. Jahrhundert." *ZS für Württembergische Landesgeschichte* 25 (1966): 321-38.
- . "Die Bischofsstädte von Basel bis Mainz in der Zeit des Investiturstreites." In Fleckenstein, ed., *Investiturstreit*, pp. 351-61.
- . "Die christliche Kirche ostwärts der Elbe bis zum Tode Ottos I." In Schlesinger, Walter, ed. *FS für Friedrich von Zahn*. Vol. 1: *Zur Geschichte und Volkskunde Mitteldeutschlands*, pp. 145-81. Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1968.
- . "Erzbischof Willigis von Mainz und das Papsttum bei der Bistumserrichtung in Böhmen und Mähren im 10. Jh." *RhVjB* 30 (1965): 1-22.

- . "St. Blasien und das Bistum Basel im 11./12. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites." *ZS für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 44 (1950): 138–48.
- Bulst, Neithard. *Untersuchungen zu den Klosterreformen Wilhelms von Dijon (962–1031)*. Pariser Historische Studien 11. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1973.
- Bultot, Robert. *La Doctrine du mépris du monde*. Vol. 4: *Le XI^e siècle*. Part 1: *Pierre Damien*. Louvain: Editions Nauwelaerts, 1963.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Docere verbo et exemplo*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979.
- . *Jesus as Mother*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Cantor, Norman F. "The Crisis of Western Monasticism, 1050–1130." *AHR* 66 (1960): 47–67.
- Chiesa e riforma nella spiritualità del sec. XI*. Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 6. Todi: Presso l'accademia Tudertina, 1968.
- Choux, Jacques. "Décadence et réforme monastique dans la province de Trèves 855–959." *Rev. bén.* 70 (1960): 204–23.
- Christianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medioevo: Espansione e resistenze*. Vol. 1. Settimana Spoleto 28 (1982).
- Claude, Dietrich. *Geschichte des Erzbistums Magdeburg bis in das 12. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 1: *Die Geschichte der Erzbischöfe bis auf Ruotger (1124)*. Cologne/Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1972.
- Constable, Giles. "Monachisme et pèlerinage au moyen âge." *RH* 258 (1977): 3–28.
- . "Monasteries, Rural Churches and the *Cura animarum* in the Early Middle Ages." In *Christianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica*, pp. 349–89.
- Cousin, Patrice. *Abbon de Fleury-sur-Loire*. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1954.
- Cowdrey, H.E.J. *The Age of Abbot Desiderius: Montecassino, the Papacy, and the Normans in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983.
- . *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.
- . "The Peace and Truce of God in the Eleventh Century." In Cowdrey, H.E.J., *Popes, Monks and Crusaders*, pp. 42–67. London: The Hambledon Press, 1984.
- Csóka, J. Lajos. *Geschichte des benediktinischen Mönchtums in Ungarn*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag (*Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 24), 1980.
- Dauphin, Hubert. *Le Bienheureux Richard, Abbé de Saint-Vanne de Verdun †1046*. Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1946.
- Davies, Horton and Marie-Hélène Davies. *Holy Days and Holidays. The Medieval Pilgrimage to Compostela*. Lewisburg, Pennsylvania: Bucknell University Press, 1982.
- Delaruelle, Etienne. "Les ermites et la spiritualité populaire." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 212–41.
- Dereine, Charles. "Odon de Tournai et la crise du cénobitisme au XI^e siècle." *Revue du moyen âge latin* 4 (1948): 137–54.
- . "La spiritualité 'apostolique' des premiers fondateurs d'Affligem (1083–1100)." *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 54 (1959): 41–65.
- Dittrich, Zdenek R. *Christianity in Great-Moravia*. Bijdragen van het Instituut voor middeleeuwse Geschiedenis der Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht 33. Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1962.
- Doerr, Otmar. *Das Institut der Inclusen in Süddeutschland*. Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens 18. Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Dressler, Fridolin. *Petrus Damiani. Leben und Werk*. *StAns* 34. Rome: Pontificium Institutum S. Anselmi, 1954.
- Duby, Georges. *The Three Orders. Feudal Society Imagined*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Duft, Johannes. "Die Beziehungen zwischen Irland und St. Gallen im Rahmen der St. Gallischen Stifts-Geschichte." (Sonderabdruck aus: Duft, Johannes and Peter Mayer, *Die irischen Miniaturen der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen*, pp. 11–83. Olben, 1953.)

- Dvornik, Francis. "Die Benediktiner und die Christianisierung Rußlands." *Erbe und Auftrag* 35 (1959): 292-310.
- . *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*. 2nd edition. Gulf Breeze, Florida: Academic International Press, 1974 (1st ed. London, 1949).
- . *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization*. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1956.
- L'Eremitismo in occidente nei Secoli XI e XII*. Settimana Mendola 2 (1965).
- Fauser, Alois. *Die Publizisten des Investiturstreites: Persönlichkeiten und Ideen*. Würzburg: Verlag Konrad Tritsch, 1935.
- Faust, Ulrich, ed. *Die Benediktinerklöster in Niedersachsen, Schleswig-Holstein und Bremen. Germania Benedictina* vol. 6: *Norddeutschland*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1979.
- Feierabend, Hans. *Die politische Stellung der deutschen Reichsabteien während des Investiturstreites*. Historische Untersuchungen 3. Breslau, 1913 (reprint ed. Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1971).
- Felten, Franz J. *Äbte und Laienäbte im Frankenreich*. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1980.
- Ferretti, Walter. "Il posto dei laici nella Chiesa secondo San Pier Damiani." In *San Pier Damiano*, 1: 233-77.
- Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Beiträge zur Mediävistik. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1986.
- . *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts*. 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1984.
- . "Reisen und Reisende." In Fichtenau, *Beiträge zur Mediävistik* 3: 1-79.
- . "Zu den Urkundenfälschungen Pilgrims von Passau." *Mitteilungen des oberösterreichischen Landesarchivs* 8 (1964): 81-100.
- Finucane, Ronald C. *Miracles and Pilgrims: Popular Beliefs in Medieval England*. London: J.M. Dent, 1977.
- Fleckenstein, Josef. *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*. Vol. 2: *Die Hofkapelle im Rahmen der ottonisch-salischen Reichskirche*. MGH Schriften 16/2. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1966.
- , ed. *Investiturstreit und Reichsverfassung*. Vorträge und Forschungen 17. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1973.
- Fleckenstein, Josef, and Karl Schmid, eds. *Adel und Kirche. Gerd Tellenbach zum 65. Geburtstag*. Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Fliche, Augustin. *La Réforme grégorienne*. 2 Vols. Louvain/Paris: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1924/1926.
- Frank, Karl Suso. *Grundzüge der Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1975.
- . "Vom Kloster als scola dominici servitii zum Kloster ad servitium imperii." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 91 (1980): 80-97.
- Fuhrmann, Horst. "Das Papsttum zwischen Frömmigkeit und Politik—Urban II. (1088-1099) und die Frage der Selbstheiligung." In Hehl, Ernst-Dieter, et al., eds. *Deus qui mutat tempora*. FS für Alfons Becker zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, pp. 157-72. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1987.
- Gajano, Sofia Boesch. "Storia e tradizione Vallombrosane." *Bullettino dell'istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo* 76 (1964): 99-215.
- Garreau, Albert. *Saint Léon IX: Pape Alsacien réformateur de l'église (1002-1054)*. Paris: Tolra, 1965.
- Gay, Jules. *Les Papes du XI^e siècle et la chrétienté*. 2nd edition. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1926.
- Geary, Patrick J. *Furta Sacra*. Revised edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
- Genicot, Léopold. "L'éremitisme du XI^e siècle dans son contexte économique et social." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 45-69.
- Gessel, Wilhelm and Peter Stockmeier, eds. *Bavaria Christiana. Zur Frühgeschichte des Christentums in Bayern*. FS Adolf Wilhelm Ziegler. Beiträge zur altbayerischen Kirchengeschichte 27. Munich: Verlag Franz X. Seitz and Val. Höfling, 1973.

- Gibson, Margaret. "The Continuity of Learning, circa 850–circa 1050." *Viator* 6 (1975): 1–13.
- Gieysztor, Alexander. "Sanctus et gloriosissimus martyr Christi Adalbertus: un État et une Église missionnaires aux alentours de l'an Mille." In *La conversione al Cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo*, pp. 611–47. Settimana Spoleto 14 (1967).
- Giseke, Paul. *Die Hirschauer während des Investiturstreites*. Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1883.
- Goez, Werner. "Reformpapsttum, Adel und monastische Erneuerung in der Toscana." In Fleckenstein, ed. *Investiturstreit*, pp. 205–39.
- Gougoud, Louis. *Ermîtes et reclus*. Vienne: Abbaye Saint-Martin de Ligugé, 1928.
- Grauert, Hermann. "Rom und—Gunther der Eremit?" *Hjb* 19 (1898): 249–87.
- Graus, František. "St. Adalbert und St. Wenzel. Zur Funktion der mittelalterlichen Heiligenverehrung in Böhmen." In Grothusen and Zernack, pp. 205–31.
- . *Volk, Herrscher und Heiliger im Reich der Merowinger: Studien zur Hagiographie der Merowingerzeit*. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1965.
- Grégoire, Reginald. "Le *De clastro animae* est-il d'un Clunisien?" *StMon* 4 (1962): 193–96.
- Grosse, Walther. "Das Kloster Wendhausen, sein Stiftergeschlecht und seine Klausnerin." *Sachsen und Anhalt* 16 (1940): 45–76.
- Grothusen, Klaus-Detlev and Klaus Zernack, eds. *Europa Slavica—Europa Orientalis*. FS für Herbert Ludat zum 70. Geburtstag. Berlin: Duncker & Humbolt, 1980.
- Grundmann, Herbert. "Eremiti in Germania dal X al XII Secolo: 'Einsiedler' e 'Klausner.'" In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 311–29.
- . *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter*. 2nd edition. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961 (1st ed. 1935).
- Haendler, Gert. "Reichskirche und Mission in der ersten Epoche der Christianisierung Mecklenburgs (bis 1066)." In *Kirche und Gesellschaft im Ostseeraum und im Norden vor der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 65–75. Acta Visbyensia 3. Visby: Museum Gotlands Fornsal, 1969.
- Häussling, Angelus A. *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1973.
- Hallinger, Kassius. *Grze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*. 2 vols. *StAns* 22/3. Rome: Herder, 1950/1951.
- . "The Spiritual Life of Cluny in the Early Days." In Hunt, ed., pp. 29–55.
- . "Woher kommen die Laienbrüder?" *Analecta sacri ordinis Cisterciensis* 12 (1956): 1–104.
- Hamilton, Bernard. "S. Pierre Damien et les mouvements monastiques de son temps." *StGreg* 10 (1975): 175–202.
- Head, Thomas, and Richard Landes, eds. *The Peace of God. Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Heath, Robert G. *Crux Imperatorum Philosophia: Imperial Horizons of the Cluniac "Confraternitas," 964–1109*. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1976.
- Hefele, Charles J. *Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux*. Translated by H. Leclercq. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1909.
- Herrmann, Klaus-Jürgen. *Das Tuskulanerpapsttum (1012–1046)*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1973.
- Heyen, Franz-Josef. "Simeon und Burchard-Poppo. Aus den Anfängen des Stiftes St. Simeon in Trier." In Fenske, pp. 195–205.
- Higounet, Charles. *Die deutsche Ostsiedlung im Mittelalter*. Berlin: Siedler Verlag, 1986.
- Hirsch, Hans. "The Constitutional History of the Reformed Monasteries during the Investiture Contest." In Barraclough, Geoffrey, ed. *Mediaeval Germany 911–1250*, pp. 131–74. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938.
- Hlawitschka, Eduard. "Herzog Gisbert von Lothringen und das Kloster Remiremont." *ZS für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 108 (1960): 422–65.

- . "Zur Klosterverlegung und zur Annahme der Benediktsregel in Remiremont." *ZS für die Geschichte des Oberrheins* 109 (1961): 249–69.
- Hoffmann, Hartmut. *Gottesfriede und Treuga Dei*. MGH Schriften 20. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1964.
- . "Von Cluny zum Investiturstreit." *AfKG* 45 (1963): 165–209.
- Hofmeister, Philipp. "Mönchtum und Seelsorge bis zum 13. Jahrhundert." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 65 (1953–54): 209–73.
- Holtzmann, Robert. *Geschichte der sächsischen Kaiserzeit (900–1024)*. Munich: Verlag Georg D.W. Callway, 1941 (reprint ed. 1967).
- Hóman, Bálint. *König Stephan I. der Heilige*. Breslau: Wilh. Gottl. Korn Verlag, 1941.
- Hourlier, Jacques. *Saint Odilon, abbé de Cluny*. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1964.
- Hubert, Jean. "L'érémisme et l'archéologie." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 462–87.
- . "La place faite aux laïcs dans les églises monastiques et dans les cathédrales aux XI^e et XII^e siècles." In *I laici*, pp. 470–87.
- Hürten, Heinz. "Gregor der Große und der mittelalterliche Episkopat." *ZfKG* 73 (1962): 16–41.
- Hunt, Noreen. *Cluny under Saint Hugh 1049–1109*. London: Edward Arnold, Ltd., 1967.
- , ed. *Cluniac Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages*. London: Macmillan, 1971.
- Hutchison, Carole. *The Hermit Monks of Grandmont*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1989.
- Irblich, Eva. *Die Vitae Sanctae Wiboradae. Ein Heiligen-Leben des 10. Jahrhunderts als Zeitbild*. St. Gallen: Kommissionsverlag Fehr'sche Buchhandlung, 1970.
- Jacobi, Johannes. "Erzbischof Poppo von Trier (1016–1047). Ein Beitrag zur geistigen und politischen Situation der Reform." *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 13 (1961): 9–26.
- Jacobs, Uwe Kai. *Die Regula Benedicti als Rechtsbuch. Eine rechtshistorische und rechtstheologische Untersuchung*. Forschungen zur kirchlichen Rechtsgeschichte und zum Kirchenrecht 16. Cologne/Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1987.
- Jaeger, Stephen C. "The Courtier Bishop in *vitae* from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century." *Speculum* 58 (1983): 291–325.
- Jakobs, Hermann. "Die Cluniazenser und das Papsttum im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert. Bemerkungen zum Cluny-Bild eines neuen Buches." *Francia* 2 (1974): 643–63.
- . *Die Hirsauer. Ihre Ausbreitung und Rechtsstellung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites*. Kölner Historische Abhandlungen 4. Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1961.
- Jestice, Phyllis G. "The Gorzian Reform and the Light under the Bushel." *Viator* 24 (1993): 51–78.
- . "Peter Damian against the Reformers." In Elder, E. Rozanne, ed. *The Joy of Learning and the Love of God: Studies in Honor of Jean Leclercq*, pp. 67–94. Cistercian Studies Series, nr. 160. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1995.
- Jilek, Heinrich. "Die Wenzels- und Ludmila-Legenden des 10. und 11. Jahrhunderts. Neuere Forschungsergebnisse." *ZS für Ostforschung* 24 (1975): 79–148.
- Kaminsky, Hans Heinrich. *Studien zur Reichsabtei Corvey in der Salierzeit*. Cologne/Graz: Böhlau-Verlag, 1972.
- . "Zur Gründung von Fruttuaria durch den Abt Wilhelm von Dijon." *ZKG* 77 (1966): 238–67.
- Kedar, Benjamin Z. *Crusade and Mission: European Approaches toward the Muslims*. Princeton: University Press, 1984.
- Keller, Hagen. "'Adelsheliger' und Pauper Christi in Ekkeberts *Vita sancti Haime-radi*." In Fleckenstein, ed., *Adel und Kirche*, pp. 307–24.
- . "Grundlagen ottonischer Königsherrschaft." In Schmid, pp. 17–34.
- . *Kloster Einsiedeln im ottonischen Schwaben*. Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte 13. Freiburg im Breisgau: Eberhard Albert Verlag, 1964.

- Kempf, Friedrich. "Die päpstliche Gewalt in der mittelalterlichen Welt. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Walter Ullmann." In *Saggi Storici intorno al papato*, pp. 117-69. *Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae* 21. Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1959.
- Klinkenberg, Hans Martin. "Versuche und Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie bei Rather von Verona." *AfKG* 38 (1956): 265-314.
- Kloczowski, Jerzy. "L'érémisme dans les territoires slaves occidentaux." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 330-54.
- Klose, Josef. "St. Wolfgang als Mönch und die Einführung der Gorzer Reform in Bayern." In Schwaiger and Staber, pp. 61-88.
- Knowles, David. *From Pachomius to Ignatius: A Study in the Constitutional History of the Religious Orders*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Königer, Albert Michael. *Burchard I. von Worms und die deutsche Kirche seiner Zeit (1000-1025)*. Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München Series 2, Nr. 6. Munich: Verlag der J.J. Lentner'schen Buchhandlung, 1905.
- Kottje, Raymond and Helmut Mauerer, eds. *Monastische Reformen im 9. u. 10. Jahrhundert* (Vorträge und Forschungen 38). Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1989.
- Kurze, Wilhelm. "Campus Malduli. Die Frühgeschichte Camaldolis." *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 44 (1964): 1-34.
- Ladner, Gerhart B. "Gregory the Great and Gregory VII: A Comparison of their Concepts of Renewal." *Viator* 4 (1973): 1-27.
- I laici nella "societas Christiana" dei secoli XI e XII*. Settimana Mendola 3 (1968).
- Lambert, Malcolm. *Franciscan Poverty*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Lang, Gotthard. "Gunther, der Eremit, in Geschichte, Sage und Kult." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 59 (1941): 3-83.
- Laqua, Hans Peter. *Traditionen und Leitbilder bei dem Ravennater Reformator Petrus Damiani 1042-1052*. Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 30. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976.
- Laudage, Johannes. *Priesterbild und Reformpapsttum im 11. Jahrhundert*. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1984.
- Lawrence, C.H. *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*. London: Longman, 1984.
- Leclercq, Jean. *Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale. Étapes et constantes*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1964.
- . "Le cloître est-il une prison?" *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 47 (1971): 407-20.
- . "La crise du monachisme aux XI^e et XII^e siècles." *Bullettino dell'istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo* 70 (1958): 19-42.
- . "L'érémisme in Occident jusqu'à l'an mil." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 27-44.
- . "'Eremus' et 'eremita.' Pour l'histoire du vocabulaire de la vie solitaire." *Collectanea ordinis Cisterciensium reformatum* 25 (1963): 8-30.
- . "L'historiographie monastique de Léon IX. à Callixte II." In *Il monachesimo et la riforma*, pp. 271-302.
- . "L'idéal monastique de saint Odon, d'après ses œuvres." In *A Cluny*, pp. 227-32.
- . "Jean de Gorze et la vie religieuse au X^e siècle." In *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 133-52. Metz: Editions Le Lorrain, 1967.
- . "Pierre le Vénérable et l'érémisme clunisien." In Constable, Giles and James Kritzeck, eds. *Petrus Venerabilis*, pp. 99-120. *StAns* 40. Rome, 1956.
- . "Reclus et recluses à Metz durant le moyen âge." *Revue ecclésiastique de Metz* 53 (1953): 356-61; 21-25.
- . "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médiévale." In Steidle, Basilius, ed. *Antonius Magnus Eremita 356-1956*, pp. 229-47. *StAns* 38. Rome, 1956.
- . "Saint Majolus and Cluny." In Leclercq, Jean. *Aspects of Monasticism*, pp. 207-226. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1978.

- . *Saint Pierre Damien, ermite et homme d'église*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1960.
- . "Saint Romuald et le monachisme missionnaire." *Rev. bén.* 72 (1962): 307–23.
- . "La séparation du monde dans le monachisme au moyen âge." In *La séparation du monde*, pp. 75–94. Problèmes de la religieuse d'aujourd'hui. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1961.
- . "Simoniaca heresis." *StGreg* 1 (1947): 523–30.
- Leclercq, Jean and Jean-Paul Bonnes. *Un maître de la vie spirituelle au XI^e siècle: Jean de Fécamp*. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1946.
- Lekai, Louis. *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1977.
- Lemaignier, Jean-François. "Encadrement religieux des campagnes et conjoncture politique dans les régions du royaume de France situés au nord de la Loire, de Charles le Chauve aux derniers Carolingiens (840–987)." In *Christianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica*, pp. 765–800.
- . "L'exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme grégorienne." In *A Cluny*, pp. 288–334.
- Leyser, Henrietta. *Hermits and the New Monasticism*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1984.
- Lippelt, Helmut. *Thietmar von Merseburg. Reichsbischof und Chronist*. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 72. Cologne/Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973.
- Löwe, Heinz, ed. *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*. 2 Vols. Stuttgart: Klett-Colta, 1982.
- Lotter, Friedrich. *Die Vita Brunonis des Ruotger. Ihre historiographische und ideengeschichtliche Stellung*. Bonner historische Forschungen 9. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1958.
- Lunardi, Giovanni. *L'ideale monastico nelle polemiche del secolo XII sulla vita religiosa*. Noci: Edizioni "La Scala," 1970.
- Macartney, Carlyle A. *The Medieval Hungarian Historians: A Critical and Analytical Guide*. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- McCormick, Michael. "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages; Crisis, Litanies, and the Carolingian Monarchy." *Viator* 15 (1984): 1–23.
- MacDonald, Allan J. *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine*. Merrick, New York: Richwood Publishing Co., 1930 (reprint ed. 1977).
- Maier, Marinus. "Ein Schwäbisch-Bayerischer Freundeskreis Gregor VII. nach der Vita Herlucae des Paul v. Bernried." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 74 (1963): 313–32.
- Malone, Edward E. *The Monk and the Martyr: The Monk as the Successor of the Martyr*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1950.
- Manteuffel, Tadeusz. *The Formation of the Polish State: The Period of Ducal Rule 963–1194*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1982.
- Mathews, Thomas F. *The Clash of Gods: a Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Mayr-Harting, H. "Functions of a Twelfth-Century Recluse." *History* 60 (1975): 337–52.
- Meade, Denis. "From Turmoil to Solidarity: The Emergence of the Vallumbrosan Monastic Congregation." *ABR* 19 (1968): 323–57.
- Meersseman, Gérard G. "Eremitismo e predicazione itinerante dei secoli XI e XII." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 164–79.
- Miccoli, Giovanni. "Pier Damiani e la vita comune del clero." In *La vita comune del clero*, 1: 186–211.
- . *Pietro Igneo. Studi sull'età Gregoriana*. Istituto storico Italiano per il medio evo 40–41. Rome: nella sede dell'istituto, 1960.
- . "Théologie de la vie monastique chez Saint Pierre Damien." *Théologie de la vie monastique* 49 (1961): 459–83.

- Mikoletzky, Hanns L. "Bemerkungen zu einer Vorgeschichte des Investiturstreites." *StGreg* 3 (1948): 233-85.
- . *Kaiser Heinrich II. und die Kirche*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 8. Vienna: Universum Verlag, 1946.
- Milano, Ilarino da. "La spiritualità dei laici nei 'Praeloquia' di Raterio di Verona." In *Raterio da Verona*, pp. 35-93.
- Milo, Yoram. "Tuscany and the Dynamics of Church Reform in the Eleventh Century." Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1979.
- Mollat, Michel. "Les moines et les pauvres XI^e-XII^e siècles." In *Il monachesimo e la riforma*, pp. 193-215.
- , ed. *Études sur l'histoire de la pauvreté*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1974.
- Il monachesimo e la riforma ecclesiastica (1049-1122)*. Settimana Mendola 6 (1971).
- Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*. Settimana Spoleto 4 (1957).
- Moore, Robert I. *The Origins of European Dissent*. London/New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.
- Morghen, Raffaello. *Gregorio VII. e la riforma della Chiesa nel secolo XI*. Revised ed. Palermo: Palumbo Editore, 1974.
- Morin, D.G. "Rainaud l'ermite et Ives de Chartres: Un épisode de la crise de cénobitisme au XI^e-XII^e siècle." *Rev. bén.* 40 (1928): 99-115.
- Morrison, Karl, ed. *The Investiture Controversy: Issues, Ideals, and Results*. Huntington, New York: R.E. Krieger Publishing Co., 1971.
- Nahmer, Dieter von der. "Die Klostergründung 'in solitudine'—ein unbrauchbarer hagiographischer Topos?" *Hessisches Jb für Landesgeschichte* 22 (1972): 90-111.
- Nußbaum, Otto. *Kloster, Priestermonch und Privatmesse*. Theophaneia 14. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1961.
- Oexle, Otto Gerhard. "Die funktionale Dreiteilung der 'Gesellschaft' bei Adalbero von Laon. Deutungsschemata der sozialen Wirklichkeit im früheren Mittelalter." *FMSI* 12 (1978): 1-54.
- Oligier, Paul R. *Les évêques réguliers: recherche sur leur condition juridique depuis les origines du monachisme jusqu'à la fin du moyen-âge*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958.
- Oury, Guy. "L'idéal monastique dans la vie canoniale. Le bienheureux Hervé de Tours (†1022)." *Revue Mabillon* 52 (1962): 1-31.
- Pacaut, Marcel. "Structures monastiques, Société et Église en Occident aux XI^e-XII^e siècles." *Cahiers d'histoire* 20 (1975): 119-36.
- Peltier, Henri. "Hugues de Fouillois chanoine regulier, prieur de Saint-Laurent-au-Bois." *Revue du moyen âge latin* 2 (1946): 25-44.
- Penco, Gregorio. "L'Eremitismo irregolare in Italia nei secoli XI-XII." *Benedictina* 32 (1985): 201-21.
- Prinz, Friedrich. *Böhmen im mittelalterlichen Europa: Frühzeit, Hochmittelalter, Kolonisationsepoche*. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 1984.
- . *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich. Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jh.)*. Munich/Vienna: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1965.
- Quarthal, Franz, ed. *Die Benediktinerklöster in Baden-Württemberg*. Germania Benedictina 5. Augsburg: Kommissionsverlag Winfried-Werk, 1975.
- Quilici, Brunetto. "Giovanni Gualberto e la sua riforma monastica." *Archivio storico italiano* 99,2 (1941): 113-32; 99,3 (1941): 27-62; 100,1 (1942): 45-99.
- Raterio da Verona*. Convegni del centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 10. Todi: Presso l'accademia Tudertina, 1973.
- Richards, Jeffrey. *Consul of God: the Life and Times of Gregory the Great*. London/Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.
- Robinson, Ian S. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*. New York: Manchester University Press, 1978.

- . "Gregory VII and the Soldiers of Christ." *History* 58 (1973): 169–92.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. "Feudal War and Monastic Peace: Cluniac Liturgy as Ritual Aggression." *Viator* 2 (1971): 129–57.
- . *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.
- . *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter. The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Rudman, Remigius. *Mönchtum und kirchlicher Dienst in den Schriften Gregors des Großen*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1956.
- Rudolph, Conrad. *The "Things of Greater Importance": Bernard of Clairvaux' Apologia and the Medieval Attitude toward Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Russell, Jeffrey B. *Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965.
- San Pier Damiano nel IX centenario della morte (1072–1972)*. 4 Vols. Cesena: Centro studi e ricerche sulla antica provincia ecclesiastica Ravennate, 1972.
- Schauwecker, Helga. "Odloh von St. Emmeram. Ein Beitrag zur Bildungs- und Frömmigkeitsgeschichte des 11. Jahrhunderts." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 74 (1963): 5–240.
- Schelb, Bernhard. "Inklusen am Oberrhein." *Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv* Neue Folge 41 (68) (1941): 174–253.
- Schieffer, Theodor. "Cluny et la querelle des Investitures." *RH* 225 (1961): 47–72.
- . *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Verträge von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130*. HS 263. Berlin: Verlag Dr. Emil Ebering, 1935.
- Schlesinger, Walter. *Kirchengeschichte Sachsens im Mittelalter*. Vol. 1. Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 27/1. Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1962.
- Schmid, Karl, ed. *Reich und Kirche vor dem Investiturstreit*. FS G. Tellenbach. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 1985.
- Schmidt, Tilmann. "Die Kanonikerreform in Rom und Papst Alexander II (1061–1073)." *StGreg* 9 (1972): 199–221.
- Schmitz, Philibert. *Histoire de l'ordre de saint-Benoît*. 2nd ed. 7 vols. Les éditions de Maredsous, 1948–1956.
- . "L'influence de saint Benoît d'Aniane dans l'histoire de l'ordre de saint-Benoît." In *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo*, pp. 401–15.
- Schneider, Annerose. "Thietmar von Merseburg über kirchliche, politische und ständische Fragen seiner Zeit." *AfKG* 44 (1962): 34–71.
- Schnitzer, Rotraut. *Die Vita B. Herlucae Pauls von Bernried. Eine Quelle zur gregorianischen Reform in Süddeutschland*. Bamberg: K. Urlaub, 1967.
- Schreiber, Georg. *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters. Recht und Verfassung. Kult und Frömmigkeit*. Regensburg/Münster, 1948.
- Schwaiger, Georg. "Der heilige Bischof Wolfgang von Regensburg (972–994): Geschichte, Legende und Verehrung." In Schwaiger and Staber, pp. 39–60.
- . "Der heilige Gotthard, Abt von Niederaltaich und Bischof von Hildesheim." In Schwaiger, pp. 111–24.
- . "Die Kanonisation Bischof Wolfgangs von Regensburg (1052)." In Gessel and Stockmeier, pp. 225–33.
- , ed. *Bavaria Sancta*. Vol. 3. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1973.
- Schwaiger, Georg and Josef Staber, eds. *Regensburg und Böhmen: FS zur Tausendjahrfeier des Regierungsantrittes Bischof Wolfgangs von Regensburg und der Errichtung des Bistums Prag*. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bistums Regensburg 6. Regensburg: Verlag des Vereins für Regensburger Bistumsgeschichte, 1972.
- Segl, Peter. *Königtum und Klosterreform in Spanien: Untersuchungen über den Cluniacenserklöster in Kastilien-Leon von Beginn des 11. bis zur Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts*. Kallmunz: Lassleben, 1974.

- Seibt, Ferdinand. "Der heilige Herzog Wenzel." In Seibt, Ferdinand, ed. *Lebensbilder zur Geschichte der böhmischen Länder*, 4: 9–22. Munich/Vienna: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1981.
- , ed. *Bohemia Sacra. Das Christentum in Böhmen 973–1973*. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1974.
- Semmler, Josef. "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahr 816." *ZKG* 74 (1963): 15–82.
- . "Corvey und Herford in der benediktinischen Reformbewegung des 9. Jahrhunderts." *FMSI* 4 (1970): 289–319.
- . "Karl der Große und das fränkische Mönchtum." In Braunsfels, Wolfgang, ed. *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*. Vol. 2, pp. 255–89. Düsseldorf: Verlag L. Schwann, 1965.
- . "Klosterreform und gregorianische Reform: Die Chorherrenstifter Marbach und Hört im Investiturstreit." *StGreg* 6 (1959–1961): 165–72.
- . *Die Klosterreform von Siegburg. Ihre Ausbreitung und ihr Reformprogramm im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*. Rheinisches Archiv 53. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag, 1959.
- . "Lampert von Hersfeld und Gisbert von Hasungen. Studien zu den monastischen Anfängen des Klosters Hasungen." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 67 (1956): 261–76.
- . "Zur Überlieferung der monastischen Gesetzgebung Ludwigs des Frommen." *DA* 16 (1960): 309–88.
- Sheedy, Charles E. *The Eucharistic Controversy of the Eleventh Century against the Background of Proto-scholastic Theology*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947.
- Spiritualità cluniacense*. Convegno del centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 2. Todi: Presso l'accademia Tudertina, 1960.
- Sproemberg, Heinrich. "Die lothringische Politik Ottos des Großen." *RhVjb* 11 (1941): 1–101.
- Staber, Josef. "Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des Fürsten Wenzeslaus und ihr Ursprungsort Regensburg." In Zagiba, Franz, ed. *Das heidnische und christliche Slawentum*, pp. 183–193. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970.
- . "Die Missionierung Böhmens durch die Bischöfe und das Domkloster von Regensburg im 10. Jahrhundert." In Schwaiger and Staber, pp. 29–37.
- Stadtmüller, Georg and Bonifaz Pfister. *Geschichte der Abtei Niederaltaich 741–1971*. Munich: Bayerische Benediktinerakademie, 1971.
- Straw, Carole. *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Sumption, Jonathan. *Pilgrimage: An Image of Mediaeval Religion*. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman & Littlefield, 1975.
- Sydow, Jürgen. "Probleme der camaldulensischen Ostmission." In Beumann, ed., *Heidenmission*, pp. 146–55.
- Székely, György. "Gemeinsame Züge der ungarischen und polnischen Kirchengeschichte des XI. Jahrhunderts." *Annales Universitatis Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös Nominatae. Sectio Historica* 4 (1962): 55–80.
- . "Ungarns Stellung zwischen Kaiser, Papst und Byzanz zur Zeit der Kluniazenserreform." In *Spiritualità cluniacense*, pp. 312–25.
- Tabacco, Giovanni. "Romualdo di Ravenna e gli inizi dell'eremitismo Camaldolese." In *L'Eremitismo in occidente*, pp. 73–119.
- . "Vescovi e monasteri." In *Il monachesimo et la riforma*, pp. 105–23.
- Tellenbach, Gerd. *The Church in Western Europe from the Tenth to the Early Twelfth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*. Reprint Edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- . "Zum Wesen der Cluniacenser." *Saeculum* 9 (1958): 370–78.

- Teske, W. "Laien, Laienmönche und Laienbrüder in der Abtei Cluny. Ein Beitrag zum 'Konversen-Problem.'" *FMSt* 10 (1976): 248–322; 11 (1977): 288–339.
- Tomek, Ernst. *Studien zur Reform der deutschen Klöster im XI. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 1: *Die Frühreform*. Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem kirchengeschichtlichen Seminar der theologischen Fakultät der k.k. Universität in Wien 4. Vienna: Mayer & Comp., 1910.
- Ueding, Leo. "Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus." In Grillmeier, Aloys and Heinrich Bacht, eds. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol. 2: *Entscheidung um Chalkedon*, pp. 569–676. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1953.
- Uhlirz, Mathilde. *Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Adalbert*. Forschungen und Vorarbeiten zu den Jahrbüchern und Regesten Kaiser Ottos III. 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Vaccari, Alberto. "Un trattato ascetico attribuito a S. Girolamo." In *Mélanges offerts au R.P. Ferdinand Cavallera*, pp. 147–62. Toulouse: Bibliothèque de l'Institut Catholique, 1948.
- Van Engen, John. "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150." *Speculum* 61/2 (1986): 269–304.
- . *Rupert of Deutz*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Vernon, Jack A. *Inside the Black Room*. New York: Clarkson N. Potter, Inc., 1963.
- Violante, Cinzio. "Il monachesimo cluniacense di fronte al mondo politico ed ecclesiastico. Secoli X e XI." In Violante, *Studi sulla cristianità medioevale*, pp. 3–67. Milan: Editrice Vita e Pensiero, 1972.
- . *La pataria milanese e la riforma ecclesiastica*. Vol. 1: *Le premesse (1045–1057)*. Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo studi storici fasc. 11–13. Rome: Nella sede dell'istituto, 1955.
- La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI e XII*. Settimana Mendola 3. 2 Vols. (1962).
- Vlasto, A.P. *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Vogel, Cyrille. "Les rites de la pénitence publique aux X^e et XI^e siècles." In Gallais, Pierre and Yves-Jean Riou, eds. *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet*, 1: 137–44. Poitiers: Société d'études médiévales, 1966.
- Vogelsgang, Margarete. "Der cluniacensische Chronist Rodulfus Glaber." *Stud. u. Mitt. OSB* 67 (1956): 25–38, 277–297; 71 (1960): 151–85.
- Vogüé, Adalbert de, ed. *La règle de saint Benoît*. Vol. 7: *Commentaire doctrinal et spirituel*. SC 186 (1977).
- Voigt, Heinrich G. *Adalbert von Prag: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kirche und des Mönchtums im zehnten Jahrhundert*. Westend/Berlin: W. Faber & Co., 1898.
- . *Brun von Querfurt: Mönch, Eremit, Erzbischof der Heiden und Märtyrer*. Stuttgart: Verlag von J.F. Steinkopf, 1907.
- Waas, Adolf. "Karls des Großen Frömmigkeit." *HZ* 203 (1966): 265–79.
- Walter, Johannes von. *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*. 2 Vols. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1903, 1906.
- Warren, Ann K. *Anchorites and their Patrons in Medieval England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Wehl, Hans-Peter. *Reichsabtei und König dargestellt am Beispiel der Abtei Lorsch mit Ausblicken auf Hersfeld, Stablo und Fulda*. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 28. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Weinfurter, Stefan. "Bemerkungen und Corrigenda zu Karl Bosls 'Regularkanoniker und Seelsorge.'" *AfKG* 62/63 (1980/1981): 381–95.
- . "Neuere Forschung zu den Regularkanonikern im deutschen Reich des 11. und 12. Jahrhunderts." *HZ* 224 (1977): 379–97.
- Wenskus, Reinhard. *Studien zur historisch-politischen Gedankenwelt Bruns von Querfurt*. Mitteleuropäische Forschungen 5. Münster/Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1956.

- Werra, Joseph. *Über den Continuator Reginonis*. Leipzig: Gressner & Schramm, 1883.
- Williams, George H. *Wilderness and Paradise in Christian Thought*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.
- Witters, Willibrord. "Pauvres et pauvreté dans les coutumes monastiques du moyen âge." In Mollat, pp. 177-216.
- Wollasch, Hans-Josef. *Die Anfänge des Klosters St. Georgen im Schwarzwald. Zur Ausbildung der geschichtlichen Eigenart eines Klosters innerhalb der Hirsauer Reform*. Forschungen zur oberrheinischen Landesgeschichte 14. Freiburg im Breisgau: Eberhard Albert Verlag, 1964.
- Wollasch, Joachim. "Der Einfluß des Mönchtums auf Reich und Kirche vor dem Investiturstreit." In Schmid, pp. 35-48.
- . "Kaiser Heinrich II. in Cluny." *FMS* 3 (1969): 327-42.
- . "Das Mönchgelübde als Opfer." *FMS* 18 (1984): 529-45.
- . *Mönchtum des Mittelalters zwischen Kirche und Welt*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973.
- . "Reform und Adel in Burgund." In Fleckenstein, ed., *Investiturstreit*, pp. 277-93.
- Zagiba, Franz, ed. *Millenium Dioeceseos Pragensis 973-1973: Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte Mitteleuropas im 9.-11. Jahrhundert*. Annales Instituti Slavici 8. Vienna: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1974.
- Zibermayr, Ignaz. *Noricum Baiern und Österreich. Lorch als Hauptstadt und die Einführung des Christentums*. 2nd edition. Horn: Verlag Ferdinand Berger, 1956.
- Zoeopf, Ludwig. *Das Heiligen-Leben im 10. Jahrhundert*. Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance 1. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1908 (reprint ed. Hildesheim: Verlag Dr. H.A. Gerstenberg, 1973).

INDEX

- Abbo of Fleury: 137
 Abbots: and care of souls 45; as preachers 134; lay abbacy 24-5, 25n.2; social role of 25-6, 27-8
 Active Life: 68, 191
 Adalbert of Magdeburg: 47
 Adalbert of Prague: 76-7
 Adhémar of Chabannes: 206
 Alexander II: 217; against Vallombrosans 234, 238
 All Souls' Day: 172
 Anianian reform: 23-4, 23-4n.1, 96; continuity of 17, 18-19
 Ansgar of Corvey: 59-61
 Antony of the Desert: 158
 Apostles: as models 194
 Apostolic life: action in world 5, 11, 63, 78-9, 287; communal life 6, 40-1; and recluses 124
 Augustine: City of God 56

 Benedict of Aniane *see* Anianian reform
 Bernard of Tiron: 13, 286
 Boniface: 20
 Boniface IV, decretal of: 189-90
 Bononius of Lucedio: 74-5
 Brogne: 17
 Bruno (Prunwart) and mission: 49
 Bruno of Cologne: 115
 Bruno of Querfurt: 80, 82-5; and martyrdom 86-7
 Burchard of Worms: 66, 99-100

 Camaldoli: 76, 104, 144; early activity in world 153; growing conservatism 154; *see also* Romuald of Ravenna
 Canons regular: 14n.27, 282-3, 287; as outgrowth of eremitism 159, 159n.70, 243
 Care of souls: 45-6, 45n.2; role of abbots 45
 Caritas (recluse): 99-100
 Caritas: 122, 161-9, 285, 287; and Church reform 166; and fellow monks 161, 162; and mission 167; and radical monks 163-4, 165, 167
 Carolingian renaissance: 19
 Carthusians: 13
 Cholomann: 81-2
 Christocentrism: 193-4
Circumcelliones: 255
 Cîteaux: 9, 10n.17
 Cluny: 17-18, 21, 42, 133, 172, 181, 187, 250; Hugh 211; Maiolus 204; Odilo 20, 59, 172, 182; Odo 20, 31, 132-3; Peter the Venerable 119
 Corvey, reform of: 179-80
Cura animarum see Care of souls

 Ecclesiastical reform: and Cluny: 210-1; and Eucharist 140, 207; and monastic liberty 137; and monks 193, 215-6; and papacy 138-9, 160, 210, 213-4; and simony 138, 207, 221-2, 235, 238, 252; monks in curia 213-4; *see also* individual popes
 Einsiedeln: 1, 62, 144
 Emperors: and mission 28, 46-48, 83; use of monasteries 26-7
 Eremitical monasteries: 82; *see* Camaldoli, Einsiedeln, Grandmont
 Eucharist: 140, 207

 Findan (recluse): 118
 Fulda, reform of: 178-9

 Godehard of Hildesheim: 67
 Gorze: 17-18, 21, 181; John of Gorze 33-4, 64; openness to world 51-2, 116
 Grandmont: 282n.8
 Gregory I: and monasticism 69; ideal spiritual life 139, 155, 190-1; *Pastoral Care* 67-9, 133, 190-1
 Gregory VII: 211; as monk 248; *see also* Hildebrand
 Grimlaicus: 90, 92-3n.4
 Guibert of Gembloux: 129-30

- Gunther the Hermit: 70-74; and Church reform 130
 Gyrovagues: 3, 5, 52, 156, 259

 Haimrad of Hasungen (hermit): 146-9
 Henry II and monastic reform: 175, 177, 178-9, 180-1
 Hermits: 93-4; activity in world 145, 148, 150, 218-9; and Church reform 148-9; and flight from world 113, 135-6; control of 97, 143, 146, 149, 152-3; danger of eremitism 142; Gunther 70-2; revival 141, 144-5
 Hildebrand: 231, 240; as monk 240-1, 265-74; activity in world 269-70; and obedience 270; asceticism 268-9
 Hirsau: activity in world 253, 254; and simony 252; asceticism 258, 265; concern for laity 253-4; preaching 254, 259; support of Gregorian reform 249, 250, 252; supported by Gregory VII 251
 Hrabanus Maurus: 29-30
 Hrotsvith of Gandersheim: 107
 Hugh of Cluny: 211
 Hugh of Fouillooy: 285-6
 Humbert of Silva Candida: 222, 231
 Hungarians *see* Magyars
 Hungary *see* Magyars

 Imitation of Christ: 3n.6, 82, 137
 Investiture Contest: 10, 213; active role of monks 16, 248, 279; propaganda 146-7, 215; *see also* Hirsau, Vallombrosa
 Irish monks: 61, 174-5

 John Gualbert: 220, 228-9; as Church reformer 233
 John of Fécamp: 66
 John of Gorze: 33-4; journey to Spain 64
 Julian of Norwich: 103

 Kiev: 47-8

 Lay fraternities: 242-3
 Leo IX: 216
 Liutbirga (recluse): 118

 Magyars: 1, 1-2n.1; mission to 46, 49

 Maiolus of Cluny: 204
 Martyrdom: 60, 64, 80-2, 84, 86, 88, 104, 236-7
 Maundy of the poor: 38
 Mission: and clothing 81, 84; and Holy Spirit 58; imperial role in 4; license 2, 83, 84; role of language 2n.2, 61, 84; to Islam 51, 64n.46, 75, 189; to Liutizi 73, 74; to Magyars 46, 49; to Prussians 77, 80
 Monasteries: and pilgrimage 197-200; as militia 31, 42, 42n.51; as paradise 39; chapels for laity 196-7; hospitality 35-8; monastic offices 32-4; pilgrimage architecture 199; presence of laity 36-7, 36n.29, 186, 187, 188, 195-6
 Monks as dead to world: 39-40, 260, 271
 Monks: and Church reform 139-40, 169, 182, 233; and obedience 239, 240, 257, 270; asceticism 185, 192; as spiritual advisors 135-6; contact with laity 224; obedience to pope 273-4, 283; proper role in world 268

 Niederaltaich, reform of: 188
 Norbert of Xanten: 131

 Odilo of Cluny: 20, 59, 172, 182, 206
 Odo of Cluny: 20, 31, 132-3
 Othloh of St. Emmeram: 46
 Otto III: 87

 Papacy: pre-reform 209; role as authority over monks 273-4, 280, 281
Pastoral Care: 67-9, 67n.57, 133, 190-1
 Pataria: 244
 Paternus (recluse): 110-11
 Peace of God: 205-6
Peregrination: 6, 57-8, 60, 79
 Peter Damian: active and contemplative lives 153; against Vallombrosans 235-6, 239-40; on withdrawal from world 219-20, 223; personal role in world 222-3, 224-6
 Peter Igneus: 241
 Peter the Venerable: and recluses 119
 Pilgrim of Passau: 2-3, 46

- Pilgrimage: 188, 189; growth of 198–9
 Poppo of Lorsch: 178, 179, 186, 192
 Poverty: as reason for monastic reform 7–10
 Prayer as monastic duty: 23, 43, 201–2
 Preaching: 73, 141, 227, 254, 260–1
 Ramihrdus of Cambrai: 279
 Rather of Verona: 31–2
 Recluses: and martyrdom 104, 110–11; and penance 108; and *peregrinatio* 112; as alternative to hermits 115; as prophets 91, 123; as religious arbiters 121, 126, 174; as spiritual advisors 91, 113, 114, 117, 120–1; as spiritual warriors 114–5; as teachers 118; asceticism 105–8, 111–2; breaking enclosure 176–7; care of poor 118; enclosure 98–9, 99n.19, 100, 125; growing interest in 94–5; liminality 105; physical withdrawal 103, 117
 Richard of St. Vanne: 174, 187–8, 206; pilgrimage 59, 188, 189
 Robert of Arbrissel: 130–1
 Romuald of Ravenna: activity in world 157; and asceticism 129, 157; and Church reform 129, 151–2; and friendship with Otto III 82; and mission 75–6, 83, 85; as preacher 154
 Sarabaites: 52–3, 147, 224, 259, 272
 Simeon of Trier (recluse): 112, 122–3, 124–5, 136
 Simony *see* Ecclesiastical reform
 Sisu (recluse): 108, 111
 St. Emmeram's, Regensburg: 54, 121
 St. Gall, reform of: 183, 186
 St. Salvi: 234, 236
 Stability: of mind 5, 59, 63, 65–6, 70, 203, 204, 221, 285–6; physical 29–30, 91, 203, 203n.94; role of original sin 29–30; to single place 96, 270–1
 Stephen of Hungary: 50, 57
 Teuzo (recluse): and Church reform 218, 220; as spiritual advisor 220
 Theoderic of St. Hubert's: 254
 Ulrich of Augsburg: 120n.96
 Vallombrosa: activities in world 227–8, 242–3, 244–5; and Peter Mezzabarba 234–41; asceticism 229–30; foundation 228; on simony 238, 242; support from Hildebrand/Gregory VII 231, 240; support from Humbert of Silva Candida 231
 Victor (recluse): 109
Vita apostolica *see* Apostolic life
 Wandering preachers: 13, 130–1, 146–9, 280, 290
 Wanlef (hermit): 146
 Wedericus (wandering preacher): 280
 Wenceslas of Bohemia and monasticism: 53–56
 Wiborada (recluse): 110, 112, 122
 Wilhelm of Mainz: 47
 William of Dijon: 178, 183–4, 188–9, 190; and Church reform 193, 207–8
 William of Hirsau: 250–1, 262–3
 Wolfgang of Regensburg: 1–6, 62–3